arXiv:1205.4652v1 [math-ph] 14 May 2012

Long Range Behaviour of van der Waals Force

Ioannis Anapolitanos [*] Israel Michael Sigal [†]

To Elliott Lieb with admiration and friendship

May 12, 2012

Abstract

We prove van der Waals - London's law of decay of the van der Waals force for a collection of neutral atoms at large separation.

1 Introduction

Van der Waals force between atoms and molecules plays a fundamental role in quantum chemistry, physics and material sciences. For instance, it defines the chemical character of many organic compounds and enable geckos - which can hang on a glass surface using only one toe - to climb on sheer surfaces (see [Wiki]). It explains why water condenses from vapor as well as many properties of molecular compounds, including crystal structures (e. g. the shapes of snowflakes), melting points, boiling points, heats of fusion and vaporization, surface tension, and densities. It forces gigantic molecules like enzymes, proteins, and DNA into the shapes required for biological activity (see [Sen]).

A microscopic explanation of this force was given by F. London soon after the discovery of quantum mechanics and was one of its early triumphs. This heuristic explanation showed that this force has a universal behavior at large distances - it decays as the inverse sixth power of the distance between atoms. This behavior was confirmed in [LT] by proving - through a sophisticated test function construction - an upper bound. Our goal in this paper is to provide a complete proof of the van der Waals - London decay law for atoms.

Let $-e$ and m denote the electron charge and mass. Consider a system of M multielectron atoms which we call a molecule though we do not assume binding between atoms. In the units where $\hbar = 1$ the hamiltonian of the system is

$$H_{\mathrm{mol}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Big(-\frac{1}{2m}\Delta_{x_i} - \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{e^2 Z_j}{|x_i - y_j|}\Big) + \sum_{i<j}^{1,N} \frac{e^2}{|x_i - x_j|} - \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{1}{2m_j}\Delta_{y_j} + \sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{Z_i Z_j e^2}{|y_i - y_j|}.$$

Here N is the total number of electrons, $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ denote the coordinates of the electrons and the nuclei, respectively, eZ_j is the charge of the j-th nucleus and m_j is the mass of the

---

[*] Dept. of Math., Univ. of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany; Supported by DFG under Grant GR 3213/1-1.

[†] Dept. of Math., Univ. of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; Supported by NSERC Grant No. NA7901

j-th nucleus. We consider a system of neutral atoms so we must have $\sum_{j=1}^{M} Z_j = N$. The operator H_{mol} acts on the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\text{fermi}}^{\text{mol}}$ of the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(N+M)})$, which accounts for the fact that the electrons are identical particles and are fermions and therefore they obey the Fermi-Dirac statistics. Also, possibly, some of the nuclei are identical and obey either the Fermi-Dirac or Bose-Einstein statistics (more details are given below). For $M = 1$, H_{mol} is the Hamiltonian of the atom with the nucleus of charge $eZ = eZ_1$.

Let $E_{m,n}$ denote the ground state energy of the ion with a nucleus of charge eZ_m and $Z_m - n$ electrons, so that $E_{m,0} = E_m$ is the ground state energy of the atom corresponding to the m-th nucleus of charge Z_m, and let $y = (y_1, ..., y_M)$ be the collection of the nuclear co-ordinates. The interaction (or cohesive) energy $W(y)$ between atoms in this system is defined as

$$W(y) := E(y) - E(\infty), \tag{1.1}$$

where $E(y)$ is the ground state energy of the system with positions of the nuclei fixed, i.e. the ground state energy of the hamiltonian

$$H_N(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}(-\frac{1}{2m}\Delta_{x_i} - \sum_{j=1}^{M}\frac{e^2 Z_j}{|x_i - y_j|}) + \sum_{i<j}^{1,N}\frac{e^2}{|x_i - x_j|} + \sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{Z_i Z_j e^2}{|y_i - y_j|}, \tag{1.2}$$

acting on the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\text{fermi}}$ of the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$, which accounts for the Fermi-Dirac statistics of electrons, and $E(\infty)$ is the energy of the system with the atoms infinitely far from each other,

$$E(\infty) = \min\{\sum_{m=1}^{M} E_{m,n_m} | \sum_{m=1}^{M} n_m = 0\}. \tag{1.3}$$

(Of course, one expects that $E(\infty) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} E_m$, see the discussion below.) As we will see below $E(y)$ as well as E_m are isolated eigenvalues of finite multiplicities. Also by the HVZ theorem below, we can retain in (1.3) only terms for which E_{m,n_m} are isolated eigenvalues.

The hamiltonian (1.2) is called the Born-Oppenheimer hamiltonian. It arises as the central object in the key technique in solving the eigenvalue problem for H_{mol}, which is called the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, and which plays an important role in quantum chemistry (for example minima of its ground state energy $E(y)$ determine shapes of molecules). In this approximation the ground state energy $E(y)$ (or the energy of an excited state) of $H_N(y)$ is considered as the potential energy of the nuclear motion, which leads to the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{nucl}} := -\sum_{j=1}^{M}\frac{1}{2m_j}\Delta_{y_j} + E(y).$$

One expects that due to the fact that the ratio of the electron and nuclear mass being very small, the eigenvalues of H_{nucl} give a good approximation to the eigenvalues of H_{mol}. For rigorous results on the Born-Oppenheimer approximation see original articles [CDS, KMSW, LeL, Hag, Hag2, PST] and the textbook [GS].

One can define the interaction energy to any order in in the electron to nuclei mass ratio (see Appendix B), but this will produce only correspondingly small corrections to our results.

It is expected, after van der Waals, that $W(y)$ is a sum of pair interactions, W_{ij}, which are attractive and decay at infinity as $-|y_i - y_j|^{-6}$. More precisely, one expects that

$$W(y) = -\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{e^4 \sigma_{ij}}{|y_i - y_j|^6} + O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{e^4}{|y_i - y_j|^7}), \tag{1.4}$$

where σ_{ij} are positive constants depending only on the parameters of the pair of atoms i, j, provided that $\min\{|y_i - y_j| : 1 \leq i < j \leq M\}$ is large enough.

We formulate a property of many body systems playing an important role below

(E) $\quad \sum_{i=1}^M E_i < \sum_{i=1}^M E_{i,n_i}, \quad \forall (n_1, \dots n_M) : \sum_i n_i = 0,\ \sum_i |n_i| > 0.$

Property (E) depends on the symmetry type σ, defined below, since the ground state energies depend on the underlying spaces on which the hamiltonians are defined. Experiments and numerical computations (see below) show that Property (E) holds for all elements for which it was tested, however, theoretically, it proven only for a system of several hydrogen atoms. If it holds, then $E(\infty) = \sum_{m=1}^M E_m$.

The simplest symmetry type for fermions of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ is the one corresponding to totally antisymmetric functions, or, what is the same, to the greatest possible spin. We begin with formulating our restlts in this special case.

Theorem 1.1 (van der Waals law; highest spin)**.** *Assume that the Hamiltonian $H_N(y)$ acts on the space $\mathcal{H}_A$ of purely antisymmetric functions and assume Condition (D) stated below. Then for large distances between atoms* (1.4) *holds for some constants $\sigma_{ij} > 0$ depending on the nature of the atoms i, j, if and only if Property (E) stated above holds.*

The theorem above is a corollary of Theorem 1.2, stated below, dealing with general symmetry types.

Now we define the physical state space, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{fermi}}$, of the Born-Oppenheimer molecule. Since electrons are identical particles and are fermions of spin $\frac{1}{2}$, the state space of the system of N electrons is the space

$$\bigwedge_1^N (L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$$

of L^2-functions, $\Psi(x_1, s_1, \dots, x_N, s_N)$, of co-ordinates, $x_1, \dots, x_N$, and spins, $s_1, \dots, s_N$ (with $s_j \in \{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}, j = 1, ..., N$) that are antisymmetric with respect to permutations of pairs (x_i, s_i). The space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{fermi}}$ is the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$ given by the projection of the space $\bigwedge_1^N (L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ onto the L^2-functions of the co-ordinates alone,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{fermi}} := \{\langle \chi, \Psi \rangle_{\mathrm{spin}} | \Psi \in \bigwedge_1^N (L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2),\ \chi : \{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}^N \to \mathbb{C}\},$$

where $\langle \chi, \Psi \rangle_{\mathrm{spin}} := \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_N \in \{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}} \bar{\chi}(s_1, \dots, s_N) \Psi(x_1, s_1, \dots, x_N, s_N)$.

We relate this space to irreducible representations, T^σ, of the group S_N, of permutations of N indices. Consider the unitary representation $T : S_N \to U(L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}))$ (unitary operators on L^2) of S_N on the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$, in detail, $\pi \in S_N \to T_\pi \in U(L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}))$, with the unitary operators T_π given by

$$(T_\pi \Psi)(x_1, ..., x_N) = \Psi(x_{\pi^{-1}(1)}, x_{\pi^{-1}(2)}, ..., x_{\pi^{-1}(N)}). \tag{1.5}$$

Then the space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{fermi}}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{fermi}} = \sum_{\sigma} \mathcal{H}^{\sigma}, \tag{1.6}$$

where σ runs over irreducible representations of the group S_N corresponding to at most two-column Young diagrams and $\mathcal{H}^\sigma$ is the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$ on which this representation reduces to multiple of the irreducible representation of the type σ (see Section 7.1 for definitions and details). We call irreducible representation labels σ the *symmetry types*.

The fact that the electrons are identical particles is expressed in the property that $H_N(y)$ commutes with the permutations

$$H_N(y) T_\pi = T_\pi H_N(y), \qquad \forall \pi \in S_N, \tag{1.7}$$

and therefore the subspaces $\mathcal{H}^\sigma$ are invariant under $H_N(y)$. This allows us to introduce the ground state energy of the system for the symmetry type σ by

$$E^\sigma(y) = \inf \sigma(H_N(y)|_{\mathcal{H}^\sigma}).$$

To define $E^\sigma(\infty)$ we need some notation. Let a be the decomposition of the molecule into neutral atoms and/or ions, $S(a) \subset S_N$ be the subgroup of S_N consisting of the permutations that keep the clusters of a invariant and let H_a be the sum of the corresponding atomic or ionic Hamiltonians (see the next section for precise definitions). Fix an irreducible representation T^σ of the group S_N. Then the restriction $T^\sigma|_{S(a)}$ is not necessarily irreducible. Therefore, there exists a family, I^σ, of irreducible representations of $S(a)$ such that

$$T^\sigma|_{S(a)} = \oplus_{\alpha \in I^\sigma} T_a^\alpha,$$

where T_a^α is the irreducible representation of $S(a)$ of the type α. The representations $\alpha \in I^\sigma$ are called induced representations and we write $\alpha \prec \sigma$. (For hydrogen atoms the group $S(a)$ is trivial and the *construction of induced representations should be omitted.*) We write

$$\alpha \prec\prec \sigma \text{ if } \alpha \prec \sigma \text{ and } \inf \sigma(H_a^\alpha) = \min_{b,\beta} \inf \sigma(H_b^\beta),$$

where H_a^α denotes the restriction of H_a onto the multiple of the irreducible representation of type α). We now denote the lowest energy of separated atoms and/or ions for the symmetry type σ as

$$E^\sigma(\infty) = \min_{a, \alpha \prec \sigma} \inf \sigma(H_a^\alpha).$$

The interaction energy for the symmetry type σ is now defined as

$$W^\sigma(y) := E^\sigma(y) - E^\sigma(\infty).$$

Finally, we state the Condition (D) of Theorem 1.1 and of the theorems below:

(D) For each $\alpha \prec\prec \sigma$ the ground state subspace of H_a^α consists only of one copy of the irreducible representation of type α.

One expects that for every symmetry type α, the ground state subspace consists of a single copy of the irreducible representation of the symmetry group, but proving this is an open problem. For a system of several hydrogen atoms Condition (D) follows from the fact that $S(a)$ is the trivial group and from Perron-Frobenious argument (see below).

The following theorem gives the van der Waals law for fixed symmetry types.

Theorem 1.2 (van der Waals forces for a fixed symmetry type)**.** *Assume Condition (D) below. Then for every symmetry type σ and every $\alpha \prec\prec \sigma$, there exist positive constants $\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}$ (defined in* (A.4)*) such that*

$$W^\sigma(y) = \min_{\alpha\prec\prec\sigma} W^{\sigma,\alpha}(y),$$

where

$$W^{\sigma,\alpha}(y) := -\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}}{|y_i - y_j|^6} + O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}),$$

if and only if Property (E) reinterpreted for the symmetry type σ holds.

For a collection of hydrogen atoms Condition (D) and Property (E) are shown below to hold and therefore the van der Waals law is always valid for such a system.

As was mentioned above, using an intricate test function Lieb-Thiring [LT] have proven an upper bound for the interaction energy with a better control of how large interatomic separations should be. These bound also works for forces between certain molecules. When σ corresponds to a Young diagram with one column (completely symmetric representation) Theorem 1.2 gives Theorem 1.1. For σ corresponding to a Young diagram of at most two columns the ground state energy of $H_N(y)$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{fermi}}$ is

$$E(y) = \min_\sigma E^\sigma(y).$$

Let σ_0 be a Yonge diagram of at most two columns for which $E(y) = E^{\sigma_0}(y)$. Then Theorem 1.2 for the specified σ_0 gives the interaction energy of the system. (Of course, if the interatomic distances are not very large it might happen that the energy surfaces for different symmetries cross and we have to take $W(y) = E^{\sigma_0}(y) - E^{\sigma_1}(\infty)$ where $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_0$ is the diagram that minimizes $E^\sigma(\infty)$.)

Theorem 1.2 describes the van der Waals force at a pairwise large separation between the atoms. For intermediate distances, the van der Waals – London law is modified due to overlapping between electron clouds of the atoms and for small distances, the van der Waals forces are repulsive (the energy is positive) as follows from the rough estimate

$$H_N(y) \geq -C + \sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{e^2 Z_i Z_j}{|y_i - y_j|},$$

for some constant C independent of y, implied by the bound $\frac{e^2 Z_m}{|x_n - y_m|} \leq -\alpha\Delta_{x_n} + \beta$, valid for any $\alpha > 0$ and a corresponding $\beta > 0$. Often the interaction energy for two atoms ($M = 2$) is modeled by the Lennard-Jones potential $W_{LJ}(y) = \frac{a}{|y_1 - y_2|^{12}} - \frac{b}{|y_1 - y_2|^6}$ or by the Buckingham potential $W_B(y) = e^{-c|y_1-y_2|} - \frac{d}{|y_1-y_2|^6}$ where the constants a, b, c, d are determined experimentally.

The van der Waals-London law is expected to be true for the case of molecules that are not polarized (including the noble gases and methane). If the molecules have dipole moments, then one expects a third power law to be true. This can be proven by the techniques developed in this paper.

For a system of several hydrogen atoms Property (E) is proven in

Proposition 1.3 (Property (E) for a system of several hydrogen atoms)**.** *For a system of several hydrogen atoms Property (E) holds and consequently van der Waals law holds always.*

Proof. Let $E^{(0)}$ denote the ground state energy of the hydrogen atom and let $E^{(m)}$ be the ground state energy of the hydrogen ion with charge $-me$ (where $m \geq 1$), i.e. the lowest eigenvalue the Hamiltonian

$$H^{(m)} = \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} H_j + \sum_{i<j}^{1,m} \frac{e^2}{|x_i - x_j|}, \tag{1.8}$$

where $H_j = -\Delta_{x_j} - \frac{e^2}{|x_j|}$ is the Hamiltonian for the hydrogen atom in the j-th coordinate. Property (E) for a system of several hydrogen atoms is reduced to the property that for any $m \geq 1$, $E^{(m)}$ satisfies

$$E^{(m)} > (m+1)E^{(0)}. \tag{1.9}$$

Let $m_* := \max\{m' \leq m |\ H^{(m')}$ has a ground state$\}$ and let $\psi^{(m_*)}$ be the ground state of $H^{(m_*)}$ corresponding to $E^{(m_*)}$. (We know from [Hi] that $m_* \geq 1$ for $m \geq m_*$.) By the definition of m_* we have $E^{(m)} = E^{(m_*)}$ and therefore $E^{(m)} = \langle \psi^{(m_*)}, H^{(m_*)} \psi^{(m_*)} \rangle$. Since $H_j \geq E_0$ for any j, we have $E^{(m)} > (m+1)E^{(0)} + \delta$, with $\delta := \langle \psi^{(m_*)}, \sum_{i<j}^{1,m_*} \frac{e^2}{|x_i - x_j|} \psi^{(m_*)} \rangle$. □

Below we show that Property (E) follows from the following stronger condition

(E') For any two nuclei i and j, $i \neq j$, in our system and for $m + n \leq Z_i, -n \leq Z_j,\ mn \geq 0, n \neq 0$, we have that

$$E_{i,m} + E_{j,0} < E_{i,m+n} + E_{j,-n}.$$

Note that Property (E) for a system of hydrogen atoms with electron statistics follows from Property (E) without statistics. Indeed, $E^{(0)}$ remains the same whereas $E^{(m)}$ increases if the statistics is taken into account.

The meaning of Property (E') is that ionization energies of atoms are greater than the electron affinities, where, in a standard terminology, the n-th ionization energy ($n \geq 1$) of an atom is the energy required to remove an electron from its $n-1$-ion and the n-th electron affinity is the energy required to remove an electron from its $-n$ ion. The table below, taken from [MA], gives first ionization energies and first electron affinities of atoms. It shows that the first ionization energies are always much larger than the first electron affinities.

Atomic number	Element	first Ionization energy (kcal/mol)	Electron affinity (kcal/mol)
1	H	313.5	17.3
2	He	566.9	-
3	Li	124.3	(14)
4	Be	214.9	-
5	B	191.3	(7)
6	C	259.6	29
7	N	335.1	-
8	O	314.0	34
9	F	401.8	79.5
10	Ne	497.2	-
11	Na	118.5	(19)
12	Mg	176.3	-
13	Al	138.0	(12)
14	Si	187.9	(32)
15	P	254	(17)
16	S	238.9	47
17	Cl	300.0	83.4
18	Ar	363.4	(16)
19	K	100.1	-
20	Ca	140.9	-
21	Sc	151.3	-
22	Ti	158	-
23	V	155	-
24	Cr	156	-
25	Mn	171.4	-

(Values in parentheses are estimated by quantum-mechanical calculation and have not been verified experimentally.)

It is experimentally verified that the higher (second third and so forth) ionization energies are bigger than the first and it is expected that the higher electron affinities affinities are lower or zero. (Only ions with at most two extra electrons – i.e. of the charges at most $-2e$ – are observed experimentally. That nuclei can bound only finite number of electrons was proven in [Rus, Sig] (with the bound $\leq 17Z$ on the number of the extra electrons). It was shown in [LSST], with some improvements by [SSS, FS1], that asymptotically ions are neutral and in [Lieb] that the maximal number of extra electrons $\leq Z+1$. The latter bound was recently improved to $< 0.22Z + 3Z^{1/3}$ in [Phan]. Moreover, it was shown in [Sol1, Sol2] that in the Hartree - Fock approximation the maximal number of extra electrons $\leq$ const.)

Finally we show

Proposition 1.4. *Property (E') implies Property (E).*

Proof. We prove (E) by induction in the number of the atoms k. For $k = 2$, Property (E) follows immediately from Property (E'). We assume that (E) holds for M, replaced by $k-1$ and show it holds for $M = k$. Indeed, let $n_1, ..., n_k$ be numbers satisfying the assumptions of condition in (E) for $M = k$. By relabelling the nuclei, if necessary, we can assume that $|n_1| \geq |n_k|$ and $n_1 n_k < 0$. If $n_1 > 0$, then, by Property (E'), we have that $E_{1,n_1} + E_{k,n_k} > E_{1,n_1+n_k} + E_k$. Therefore, $E_{1,n_1} + ... + E_{k-1,n_{k-1}} + E_{k,n_k} > E_{1,n_1+n_k} + E_{2,n_2} + ... + E_{k-1,n_{k-1}} + E_k$, which together with the induction hypothesis implies Property (E) for $M = k$. If $n_1 < 0$, then, by Property (E'), we have that $E_{1,n_1} + E_{k,n_k} > E_{1,0} + E_{k,n_k+n_1}$ and we arrive to the same conclusion. $\square$

To simplify exposition we first treat the case without taking statistics into account and then modify our results and analysis for the case of an appropriate statistics. Without statistics, Condition (D) follows from the positivity improving property of $e^{-\beta H_a}, \beta > 0$ and from Perron-Frobenious theory (see for example [RSIV]). Therefore, the statement becomes

Theorem 1.5 (van der Waals forces without statistics)**.** *Consider the hamiltonians* $H_N(y)$ *on the entire* $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$. *Then for* $\min\{|y_i - y_j| : 1 \leq i < j \leq M\}$ *large enough* (1.4) *holds with the constants* σ_{ij} *defined in* (3.43) *if and only if Property (E) stated above holds.*

Note that when σ corresponds to a Young diagram with one row (completely symmetric representation) Theorem 1.2 gives Theorem 1.5.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss preliminaries of quantum many body systems. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.5 modulo some technical relations which are proven in Sections 4, 5 and 6. In Section 7 and in Appendix A we rework the proof of Theorem 1.5 to prove Theorem 1.2.

Notation. We collect here general notation used in this paper. In the text C will denote a positive constant which might be different from one equation to the other, but which is independent of the nuclear co-ordinates $y_1, \dots y_M$. We will use the notation $\lesssim$ for inequalities that are true up to such a constant. We will write $A \doteq B$ if $\|A - B\| \lesssim e^{-CR}$, in an appropriate norm, where C is some positive constant and

$$R = \min\{|y_i - y_j| : 1 \leq i, j \leq M, i \neq j\}. \tag{1.10}$$

For any Banach space X, we denote $B(X) := \{f : X \to X : f \text{ linear and bounded}\}$. For an operator A, the symbols $\sigma(A)$ and $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(A)$ stand for the spectrum and the essential spectrum, correspondingly. We also use the notation $\langle x \rangle = (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\Delta = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Delta_{x_j}$, $\nabla = (\nabla_{x_1}, ..., \nabla_{x_N})$ with Δ_{x_j}, ∇_{x_j} the Laplacian and gradient acting on the coordinate $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^3$, respectively. Finally, $\|\cdot\|$ will denote the L^2-norm of a function or the $B(L^2)-$norm of an operator, depending on the context, and the symbol $O(\delta)$ is understood in this norm.

Acknowledgements. Our interest in this problem derived from several talks by and personal conversations with Herbert Spohn on the Casimir- Polder effect. The first author is grateful to Volker Bach, Marcel Griesemer, Alessandro Giuliani and Artem Dudko for useful discussions. His research was supported in part by NSERC under Grant No. NA7901 and in part by the German Science Foundation under Grant No. 3213/1-1. The last author is grateful to Jérémy Faupin, Alessandro Pizzo and, especially Jürg Fröhlich and Elliott Lieb for very useful and inspiring discussions. His research was supported in part by NSERC under Grant No. NA7901.

2 Preliminaries about many body systems

2.1 General properties of $H_N(y)$

The general information on the spectrum of the Hamiltonian (1.2) is given in the following theorem which is a special case of the HVZ Theorem (see e.g. [HS, GS, CFKS]).

Theorem 2.1. $\sigma_{ess}(H_N(y)) = [\Sigma, \infty)$, *where* $\Sigma = \inf \sigma(H_{N-1}(y))$.

This theorem says that the essential (continuous) spectrum of $H_N(y)$ originates from the molecule shedding of an electron which moves freely at infinity and therefore whose energy spectrum changes continuously. The next result shows that $H_N(y)$, as well as each atom, has a well-localized ground state (see e.g. [HS, GS, CFKS]):

Theorem 2.2. *The operator $H_N(y)$ has infinite number of eigenvalues, E_j, below its essential spectrum, $\sigma_{ess}(H_N(y))$. Moreover, the corresponding eigenfunctions, Ψ_j, are exponentially localized i.e.*

$$|\Psi_j(x)| \leq Ce^{-\delta|x|}, \tag{2.1}$$

for any $\delta < \sqrt{\Sigma - E_j}$. Here $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ and $\Sigma := \inf \sigma_{ess}(H_N(y))$.

The first part of the statement as far as atoms are concerned is known as the Zhislin theorem and the second part, as the Combes - Thomas bound. The last theorem shows that the atoms and Born-Oppenheimer molecules are stable in the sense that at sufficiently low energy they are well localized in the space. However, it says nothing about stability of true molecules. The likely source of instability of molecules is not shedding of an electron but breaking up into atoms or ions which in total have the same energy as the molecule. So far the only molecule proven to be stable is the hydrogen molecule H_2 (see [BFGR]).

The uniqueness of the ground state is a delicate issue. Without statistics the ground state of Schrödinger operators H is unique (non-degenerate). This follows from the positivity improving property of $e^{-\beta H}, \beta > 0$ and from Perron-Frobenious theory as mentioned above. For spaces with statistics the ground state energy is in general degenerate (for an irreducible representation $T^{\sigma}_{S_N}$ of the permutation S_N, it is at least the dimension of this representation) but its multiplicity is not known.

Proposition 2.3. *If Ψ is an eigenfunction of a Hamiltonian H_A (of the form* (2.4) *below), corresponding to a non degenerate eigenvalue then the one electron density of Ψ is spherically symmetric.*

Proof. For any rotation R in $\mathbb{R}^3$ we consider the transformation T_R defined by

$$T_R\Psi(x_1, ..., x_k) = \Psi(R^{-1}x_1, ..., R^{-1}x_k).$$

Since the Coulomb potentials are spherically symmetric, we have that H_A commutes with T_R, i.e. $H_A T_R = T_R H_A$. Since Ψ is eigenfunction of H_A the last relation gives that $T_R\Psi$ is also an eigenfunction of H_A corresponding to the same eigenvalue. Since the eigenvalue is non degenerate we obtain that $T_R\Psi = c(R)\Psi$, where $c(R)$ is a complex valued function. Since T_R is unitary we have that $|c(R)| = 1$ for any R and therefore,

$$|\Psi(x_1, ..., x_k)|^2 = |\Psi(R^{-1}x_1, ..., R^{-1}x_k)|^2,$$

for any rotation R. Using this and the definition of the one-electron density, we conclude that the latter is spherically symmetric. □

Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 still hold for fixed symmetry types, while and an appropriate extension of Proposition 2.3 is given in Subsection 7.1, where we begin our analysis hamiltonians of fixed symmetry types.

2.2 Decompositions

Recall that M and N are the numbers of the nuclei and electrons. Let $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\}$ be a partition of $\{1, 2, ..., N\}$ into disjoint subsets some of which might be empty. With the set A_j we associate the j-th nucleus of charge eZ_j by assigning the electrons of coordinates in A_j to be in the same atom/ion as the j-th nucleus. This gives a decomposition of the system. We denote the collection of all such decompositions by $\mathcal{A}$ and we will call $A_1, ..., A_M$ clusters of the decomposition a. The set of all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ with $|A_j| = Z_j$ for all $j = 1, ..., M$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{at}$. Its elements correspond to decompositions of our system to neutral atoms.

If $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\}$ and $b = \{B_1, ..., B_M\}$ are elements of $\mathcal{A}^{at}$, then there exists a permutation $\pi \in S_N/S(a)$ (here / denotes the set theoretic difference), where $S(a)$ is the subgroup of S_N consisting of the permutations that keep the clusters $A_1, ..., A_M$ of a invariant, such that

$$B_j = \{\pi^{-1}(i) | i \in A_j\}, \forall j \in \{1, ..., M\}. \tag{2.2}$$

In this case we write $b = \pi a$. Various $b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ are related by permutations of the electrons and could be labeled as $b = a_\pi = \pi a$, $\pi \in S_N/S(a)$ with some redundancy. Note that we could use also more general $K-$cluster decompositions and finer decompositions into $> M$ subsystems, but we do not need this. For each decomposition $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\} \in \mathcal{A}$ we define the Hamiltonian

$$H_a = \sum_{m=1}^{M} H_{A_m}, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$H_{A_m} := \sum_{i \in A_m} (-\Delta_{x_i} - \frac{e^2 Z_m}{|x_i - y_m|}) + \sum_{i,j \in A_m, i<j} \frac{e^2}{|x_i - x_j|}, \tag{2.4}$$

(so H_{A_m} is the Hamiltonian of the m-th atom or ion and H_a is the sum of the Hamiltonians of the atoms or ions of the decomposition a) and the inter-cluster interaction $I_a := H_N(y) - H_a$. In other words I_a consists of all terms of interaction between the different atoms/ions in the decomposition a. We have that

$$H_N(y) = H_a + I_a. \tag{2.5}$$

Let E_a and Ψ_a be the ground state energy and ground state of H_a, respectively. Then $H_a \Psi_a = E_a \Psi_a$. We have that $E_a = \sum_{m=1}^{M} E_{A_m}$ and

$$\Psi_a(x_1, ..., x_N) = \prod_{m=1}^{M} \phi_{A_m}(x_{A_m}), \tag{2.6}$$

where E_{A_m} and ϕ_{A_m} are the ground state energy and the corresponding ground state of the atom/ion A_m and $x_{A_m} = (x_i : i \in A_m)$. (For an atom we denote $E_{A_m} =: E_m$.)Furthermore,

$$\phi_{A_m}(x_{A_m}) = \phi_m(x_{A_m} - y_m), \tag{2.7}$$

with ϕ_m the ground state of the m-th atom with the nucleus fixed at the origin and $x_{A_k} - y_m = (x_i - y_m : i \in A_m)$. Throughout the text we will always assume that $\|\phi_m\| = 1$ for all $m = 1, ..., M$. Note that by the definition of a's, $\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} E_a = E(\infty)$, where $E(\infty)$ was defined in (1.3). (If Property (E) holds, as we expect it always does, than $E_a = E(\infty)$, $\forall a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$.) Standard estimates (see [HS]) give that there exists $\theta > 0$ such that

$$\|e^{\theta \langle x_{A_m} \rangle} \partial^\alpha \phi_m\| \lesssim 1, \forall \alpha \text{ with } 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2, \tag{2.8}$$

where α is a multiindex with each index corresponding to differentiation in some body variable. For $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\} \in \mathcal{A}$ we define $y_a = (y_{a,1}, ..., y_{a,N})$, where $y_{a,i} = y_m$ for $i \in A_m$. In other words $y_{a,i}$ is the coordinate of the nucleus that x_i is assigned to. From (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8) we obtain that

$$\|e^{\theta \langle x - y_a \rangle} \partial^\alpha \Psi_a\| \lesssim 1, \forall \alpha \text{ with } 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2, \tag{2.9}$$

where $x = (x_1, ..., x_N)$.

3 The general approach (without statistics)

In this section we lay out the general set-up for our approach without taking the statistics into account. Our goal is to prove Theorem 1.5, under certain technical assumptions, which are then verified in later sections. In what follows we omit the argument y and write E and H for $E(y)$ and $H_N(y)$, respectively.

3.1 Feshbach map

Let P be an orthogonal projection and $P^\perp = 1 - P$. Introduce the notation $H^\perp = P^\perp H P^\perp$. We will use the Feshbach-Schur method (see [BFS, GS]), which, as applied to the quantum Hamiltonian H, states that if

(a) $\mathrm{Ran}(P) \subset D(H)$ (domain of H) and therefore $\|HP\| < \infty$;

(b) The operator $(H^\perp - \lambda)$ is invertible;

then the Feshbach-Schur map

$$F_P(\lambda) = (PHP - U(\lambda))|_{\mathrm{Ran}\, P}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$U(\lambda) := PHP^\perp (H^\perp - \lambda)^{-1} P^\perp HP, \tag{3.2}$$

is well defined and

$$\lambda \text{ eigenvalue of } H \iff \lambda \text{ eigenvalue of } F_P(\lambda). \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, the eigenfunctions of H and $F_P(\lambda)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue λ are connected as

$$H\psi = \lambda\psi \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad F_P(\lambda)\phi = \lambda\phi, \tag{3.4}$$

where ϕ, ψ are related by the following equations

$$\phi = P\psi, \ \psi = Q(\lambda)\phi. \tag{3.5}$$

Here the family of operators $Q(\lambda)$ is defined as

$$Q(\lambda) = P - P^{\perp}(H^{\perp} - \lambda)^{-1}P^{\perp}HP. \tag{3.6}$$

(Remember that we do not display the $y-$dependence of various objects.)

In what follows we will explain how we are going to use the Feshbach map. The first step is to choose the orthogonal projection P.

3.2 Orthogonal projection P

We define the projection P, to be used in the Feshbach-Schur method described above, as the orthogonal projection on span$\{\Psi_a : a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}\}$. According to (3.1), we have to compute PHP and $U(\lambda)$. To this end we use that the functions Ψ_a are almost pairwise orthogonal for large R (where R is defined in (1.10)), i.e that

$$\langle \Psi_a, \Psi_b \rangle \doteq \delta_{a,b}, \tag{3.7}$$

following from (2.9). This implies that the matrix $(g_{ab}) := (\langle \Psi_a, \Psi_b \rangle) \doteq \mathbf{1}$. Hence, we can write

$$P = \sum_{a,b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_a\rangle g^{ab} \langle \Psi_b|, \tag{3.8}$$

where (g^{ab}) is the inverse of the matrix (g_{ab}). Since $(g_{ab}) \doteq \mathbf{1}$, we have that this inverse satisfies

$$(g^{ab}) \doteq \mathbf{1}. \tag{3.9}$$

As a consequence, we have

$$P \doteq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a|. \tag{3.10}$$

To show that the Feshbach map exists, we note that $\mathrm{Ran}(P) \subset \mathrm{Dom}(H)$ since the range of P is spanned by $(\Psi_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}}$ and by (2.9) each Ψ_a is in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$. Hence the condition (a) holds. We will prove in Section 4 that, under Property (E), there is a $\gamma > 0$, independent of y s.t. for R large enough, the *stability bound*

$$H^{\perp} \geq E(\infty) + 2\gamma, \tag{3.11}$$

where $E(\infty)$ was defined in (1.3), holds. We *assume* this for now. Using the last relation we obtain that $H^{\perp} - \lambda$ is invertible for all $\lambda \leq E(\infty) + \gamma$. Thus the condition (b) is also satisfied and, for all $\lambda \leq E(\infty) + \gamma$, the Feshbach Schur map $F_P(\lambda)$ is well defined.

Our goal now is to estimate the two terms on the r.h.s of (3.1). Before we proceed we record the important fact that P commutes with the permutations

$$PT_{\pi} = T_{\pi}P, \quad \forall \pi \in S_N, \tag{3.12}$$

where, recall, T_{π} are unitary operators given by (1.5).

3.3 Estimate of PHP

We show that

$$PHP \doteq E(\infty)P. \tag{3.13}$$

Indeed, using (3.8) and (3.9) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} PHP &= \sum_{a,b,c,d \in \mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_a\rangle g^{ab} \langle \Psi_b, H\Psi_c\rangle g^{cd} \langle \Psi_d| \\ &\doteq \sum_{a,c \in \mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_a\rangle \langle \Psi_a, H\Psi_c\rangle \langle \Psi_c|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Next, the relations $H\Psi_c = (H_c + I_c)\Psi_c = (E(\infty) + I_c)\Psi_c$, (3.7) and (3.10) give

$$PHP \doteq E(\infty)P + \sum_{a,c \in \mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_a\rangle \langle \Psi_a, I_c\Psi_c\rangle \langle \Psi_c|. \tag{3.15}$$

Lemma 3.1. *For all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$, we have*

$$\langle \Psi_a, I_b \Psi_b\rangle \doteq 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. We first prove (3.16) for $a \neq b$. By Cauchy Schwartz and the inequality $\|fg\| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty}\|g\|$ (recall that for functions $\|.\|$ is always the L^2 norm) we obtain that

$$|\langle \Psi_a, I_b\Psi_b\rangle| \leq \|e^{\theta\langle x-y_a\rangle}\Psi_a\| \|e^{-\theta(\langle x-y_a\rangle + \langle x-y_b\rangle)}\|_{L^\infty} \|I_b e^{\theta\langle x-y_b\rangle}\Psi_b\|.$$

Now, using (2.9) to bound the first factor on the r.h.s., using the estimate $e^{-\theta(\langle x-y_a\rangle+\langle x-y_b\rangle)} \leq e^{-\theta\langle y_a-y_b\rangle}$, which follows from the triangle inequality for the bracket $\langle\cdot\rangle$, to bound the second factor and finally using that I_b is bounded relative to the Laplacian to handle the third one, we obtain that

$$|\langle \Psi_a, I_b\Psi_b\rangle| \lesssim e^{-cR}\|(1-\Delta)e^{\theta\langle x-y_b\rangle}\Psi_b\|.$$

The last relation together with relation (2.9) and the boundedness of the derivatives of $\langle x-y_b\rangle$ implies relation (3.16) for $a \neq b$.

We will now prove that $\langle \Psi_a, I_a\Psi_a\rangle \doteq 0$. Let $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\}$. We have that

$$I_a = \sum_{i<j}^{1,M} I_{A_iA_j}, \qquad I_{A_iA_j} := \sum_{l\in A_i, m\in A_j} I_{ij}^{lm}, \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$I_{ij}^{lm} = -\frac{e^2}{|y_j - x_l|} - \frac{e^2}{|y_i - x_m|} + \frac{e^2}{|y_i - y_j|} + \frac{e^2}{|x_l - x_m|}. \tag{3.18}$$

We pass to the variables

$$z_{lr} = x_l - y_r, \ \forall l \in A_r, \forall r = 1, ..., M, \tag{3.19}$$

and write $z_{A_r} = (z_{lr} : l \in A_r)$ and $dz_{A_r} = \prod_{l\in A_r} dz_{lr}$. Using (2.7), we obtain that

$$\langle \Psi_a, I_{ij}^{lm}\Psi_a\rangle = \int dz_{A_i} dz_{A_j} \tilde{I}_{ij}^{lm} |\phi_i(z_{A_i})|^2 |\phi_j(z_{A_j})|^2, \tag{3.20}$$

where

$$\tilde{I}_{ij}^{lm} = -\frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}+z_{li}|} - \frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}-z_{mj}|} + \frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}|} + \frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}+z_{li}-z_{mj}|}, \tag{3.21}$$

Since by Proposition 2.3 the one electron densities of the functions ϕ_i, ϕ_j are spherically symmetric, we have by Newton's Theorem (see for example [LL]) that

$$\int |\phi(z_{A_i})|^2 \frac{1}{|y_{ij}+z_{li}|} dz_{A_i} \doteq \frac{1}{|y_{ij}|} \int_{|z_{li}|\leq|y_{ij}|} |\phi(z_{A_i})|^2 dz_{A_i}.$$

with $y_{ij} = y_i - y_j$. Using that the ground state is normalized and is exponentially decaying, we have

$$\int |\phi(z_{A_i})|^2 \frac{1}{|y_{ij}+z_{li}|} dz_{A_i} \doteq \frac{1}{|y_{ij}|}. \tag{3.22}$$

As a consequence,

$$\int |\phi_i(z_{A_i})|^2 |\phi_j(z_{A_j})|^2 \frac{1}{|y_{ij}+z_{li}|} dz_{A_i} dz_{A_j} \doteq \frac{1}{|y_{ij}|}, \forall l \in A_i. \tag{3.23}$$

In a similar way we can obtain that

$$\int |\phi_i(z_{A_i})|^2 |\phi_j(z_{A_j})|^2 \frac{1}{|z_{mj}-y_{ij}|} dz_{A_i} dz_{A_j} \doteq \frac{1}{|y_{ij}|}, \forall m \in A_j. \tag{3.24}$$

Furthermore, using (3.22) twice, we can show that

$$\int |\phi_i(z_{A_i})\phi_j(z_{A_j})|^2 \frac{1}{|y_{ij}+z_{li}-z_{mj}|} dz_{A_i} dz_{A_j} \doteq \frac{1}{|y_{ij}|}. \tag{3.25}$$

Equations (3.20), (3.21), (3.23), (3.24) and (3.25) imply $\langle \Psi_a, I_{ij}^{lm} \Psi_a \rangle \doteq 0$, for all $i, j \in \{1, ..., M\}$ with $i \neq j$ and $l \in A_i, m \in A_j$, which together with (3.17) implies that $\langle \Psi_a, I_a \Psi_a \rangle$, and therefore (3.16) is proven. □

The relations (3.15) -(3.16) imply (3.13).

3.4 Rough bounds on E

Before proceeding to analysis of $U(\lambda)$ we prove rough bounds on E.

Lemma 3.2. *The ground state energy E of H satisfies the following inequalities:*

$$-\sum_{1=i<j}^{M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^6} \lesssim E - E(\infty) \lesssim e^{-CR}. \tag{3.26}$$

Note that the left hand side gives a bound from below of the van der Waals interaction energy which is sharp in the order of magnitude.

Proof. The right hand side of (3.26) follows immediately, since using the relations (2.5), $H_a\Psi_a = E(\infty)\Psi_a$, and (3.16) we obtain that

$$E \leq \langle \Psi_a, H\Psi_a\rangle = \langle \Psi_a, H_a\Psi_a\rangle + \langle \Psi_a, I_a\Psi_a\rangle$$

$$= E(\infty) + \langle \Psi_a, I_a\Psi_a\rangle \leq E(\infty) + e^{-CR}.$$

We will now show the lower bound in (3.26).

Let $\lambda \leq E(\infty) + \gamma$, where $\gamma > 0$ is the same as in (3.11). Then by (3.2) and (3.11), $U(\lambda)$ is well-defined and is positive definite, $U(\lambda) \geq 0$. Therefore, the finite rank operator $F_P(\lambda)$ defined in (3.1) is well defined. Let $\nu(\lambda, y)$ be the lowest eigenvalue of $F_P(\lambda)$ (recall that H and therefore $F_P(\lambda)$ depends on y). We consider the fixed point problem

$$\lambda = \nu(\lambda, y)$$

on the interval $(-\infty, E(\infty) + \gamma]$. We will show below that for R large enough the fixed point problem has a unique solution $\lambda_0(y)$.

Using (3.8), (3.9), $H\Psi_a = (H_a + I_a)\Psi_a = (E(\infty) + I_a)\Psi_a$ and that $P^\perp E(\infty)\Psi_a = 0$, we obtain

$$P^\perp HP \doteq \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} P^\perp|I_a\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a| \quad \text{and} \quad PHP^\perp \doteq \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_a\rangle\langle I_a\Psi_a|P^\perp. \tag{3.27}$$

(Note that due to (2.9) the operators on the r.h.s and l.h.s. are bounded.) The relations (3.2), (3.11) and (3.27) give that

$$U(\lambda) \doteq \sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_a\rangle U^{ab}(\lambda)\langle\Psi_b|, \tag{3.28}$$

where

$$U^{ab}(\lambda) := \langle \Psi_a, I_aP^\perp(H^\perp - \lambda)^{-1}P^\perp I_b\Psi_b\rangle. \tag{3.29}$$

We show now that

$$\|I_a\Psi_a\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^3}. \tag{3.30}$$

Recall that for $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\}$, the intercluster interaction I_a can be written as (3.17) - (3.18), i.e. $I_a = \sum_{l<m}^{1,M} I_{A_lA_m}$, $I_{A_iA_j} = \sum_{l\in A_i, m\in A_j} I_{ij}^{lm}$, with I_{ij}^{lm} given in (3.18). The function I_{ij}^{lm}, written in the variables (3.19), is

$$I_{ij}^{ml} = -\frac{e^2}{|z_{li} + y_{ij}|} - \frac{e^2}{|y_{ij} - z_{mj}|} + \frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}|} + \frac{e^2}{|z_{li} - z_{mj} - y_{ij}|}.$$

Using that

$$|z \pm y_{ij}|^{-1} = |y_{ij}|^{-1}\Big(1 \pm \frac{2z\cdot\hat{y_{ij}}}{|y_{ij}|} + \frac{|z|^2}{|y_{ij}|^2}\Big)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3.31}$$

and expanding in z_{li} and z_{mj}, we obtain that

$$I_{ij}^{lm} = \frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}|}\left[-\frac{(z_{li} - z_{mj})\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}}}{|y_{ij}|} + \frac{z_{li}\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}}}{|y_{ij}|} - \frac{z_{mj}\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}}}{|y_{ij}|} - \frac{|z_{li} - z_{mj}|^2 - 3((z_{li} - z_{mj})\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}})^2}{2|y_{ij}|^2}\right]$$

$$+\frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}|}\left[\frac{|z_{li}|^2-3(z_{li}\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}})^2}{2|y_{ij}|^2}+\frac{|z_{mj}|^2-3(z_{mj}\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}})^2}{2|y_{ij}|^2}\right]+O(\frac{|z|^3}{|y_{ij}|^4}),$$

where $|z|:=\max_{l,m}(z_{li},z_{mj})$, provided $|z|\le\frac{1}{3}|y_{ij}|$, which in this case gives that

$$I_{ij}^{lm}=\frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}|^3}f_{ij}^{lm}(z,\widehat{y_{ij}})+O(\frac{|z|^3}{|y_{ij}|^4}),\qquad\text{for}\quad |z|\le\frac{1}{3}|y_{ij}|,\tag{3.32}$$

where $f_{ij}^{lm}:=z_{li}\cdot z_{mj}-3(z_{li}\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}})(z_{mj}\cdot\widehat{y_{ij}})$. On the other hand, using (2.9) and using that I_a is bounded relative to the Laplacian, we obtain that

$$\|I_a\chi_{|z|\ge\frac{1}{3}|y_{ij}|}\Psi_a\|\lesssim e^{-c|y_{ij}|},\tag{3.33}$$

where χ_Ω is a smoothed out characteristic function of the set Ω. This estimate together with (3.32) gives (3.30). The estimate (3.30), together with (3.2), (3.28), (3.29), $\|(H^\perp-\lambda)^{-1}\|\lesssim 1$ and the arithmetic mean-geometric mean inequality, shows that under (3.11),

$$|\partial_\lambda^m U(\lambda)|\lesssim\sum_{1=i<j}^{M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^6},\ m\ge 0,\tag{3.34}$$

uniformly in $\lambda\le E(\infty)+\gamma$.

By (3.1), (3.13) and (3.34), we have that $|\nu(\lambda,y)-E(\infty)|\lesssim\sum_{1=i<j}^{M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^6}$ and $|\partial_\lambda\nu(\lambda,y)|\lesssim\sum_{1=i<j}^{M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^6}$ uniformly in $\lambda\le E(\infty)+\gamma$. Hence, for R sufficiently large, ν is a contraction and maps $(-\infty,E(\infty)+\gamma)$ to $[E(\infty)-\gamma,E(\infty)+\gamma]$. Since ν maps the interval $[E(\infty)-\gamma,E(\infty)+\gamma]$ to itself and is a contraction on this interval, the fixed point problem has a unique solution $\lambda_0(y)$ in $[E(\infty)-\gamma,E(\infty)+\gamma]$.

From (3.1), (3.13) and (3.34) we obtain that

$$F_P(\lambda_0(y))-E(\infty)\gtrsim-\sum_{1=i<j}^{M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^6}$$

and since $\lambda_0(y)$ is eigenvalue of $F_P(\lambda_0(y))$ we obtain that

$$-\sum_{1=i<j}^{M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^6}\lesssim\lambda_0(y)-E(\infty).\tag{3.35}$$

By isospectrality of the Feshbach map, (3.4), we obtain that $\lambda_0(y)$ is an eigenvalue of H.

We will now show that

$$E=\lambda_0(y),\tag{3.36}$$

i.e that $\lambda_0(y)$ is the ground state energy energy of H. Indeed, since $\lambda_0(y)$ is eigenvalue of H and E is the lowest eigenvalue of H we have that $E\le\lambda_0(y)$. So it is enough to show that $E\ge\lambda_0(y)$. First we show that for fixed y, $F_P(\lambda)$ is a decreasing function of λ on $(-\infty,E(\infty)+\gamma]$. Indeed, for any $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in(-\infty,E(\infty)+\gamma]$ with $\lambda_1<\lambda_2$ the operator $(H^\perp-\lambda I)^{-1}$ is defined bounded and differentiable on $[\lambda_1,\lambda_2]$ and therefore by the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus

$$(H^\perp-\lambda_2)^{-1}=(H^\perp-\lambda_1)^{-1}+\int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2}(H^\perp-\lambda)^{-2}dx.$$

Since $(H^\perp - \lambda)^{-2} \geq 0$, we obtain that $(H^\perp - \lambda I)^{-1}$ is an increasing function of λ on $(-\infty, E(\infty)+\gamma]$. Therefore, by (3.1) and (3.2) $F_P(\lambda)$ is a decreasing function of λ. Since $E \leq \lambda_0(y)$ and $F_P(\lambda)$ is decreasing in λ we obtain that

$$F_P(\lambda_0(y)) \leq F_P(E). \tag{3.37}$$

Since we have $F_P(\lambda_0(y)) \geq \lambda_0(y)$ (because $\lambda_0(y)$ is the lowest eigenvalue of $F_P(\lambda_0(y))$), the relation (3.37) gives that $\lambda_0(y) \leq F_P(E)$. The last relation together with the fact that E is eigenvalue of $F_P(E)$ gives $E \geq \lambda_0(y)$. The relations $E \leq \lambda_0(y)$ and $E \geq \lambda_0(y)$ give (3.36). The relations (3.35) and (3.36) give the left inequality of (3.26). This completes the proof of (3.26). □

The estimate (3.11) together with (3.26) gives that for R sufficiently large

$$H^\perp - E \geq c > 0, \qquad \|(H^\perp - E)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1. \tag{3.38}$$

Consequently, due to its definition (3.29), it follows that the matrix $(U^{ab}(E))$ is well-defined, non-negative and uniformly bounded.

3.5 Estimate of $U(E)$

We recall that H_{A_m} denotes the Hamiltonian of the m-th atom and E_m denotes its ground state energy. We let P_{ij} stand for the projection onto the ground state of $H_{A_i} + H_{A_j}$ and $P_{ij}^\perp := \mathbf{1} - P_{ij}$. Let $|y_{ij}| = |y_i - y_j|$.

Recall that $x = (x_1, ..., x_N)$ is the collection of the electron coordinates. Let $\varphi(x) \equiv \varphi_R(x)$ be a C^2 monotonically increasing function of $\langle x\rangle$, where, recall, $\langle x\rangle = (1+|x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, with uniformly bounded derivatives of first and second order (in both x, R) and satisfying,

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \langle x\rangle, \text{ if } \langle x\rangle \leq R-1 \\ R, \text{ if } \langle x\rangle \geq R+1. \end{cases} \tag{3.39}$$

Recall that $y_a = (y_{a,1}, ..., y_{a,N})$ where $y_{a,i} = y_m$ for $i \in A_m$ and a decomposition $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\} \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$. In other words $y_{a,i}$ denotes the coordinate of the nucleus that the electron with coordinate x_i is assigned to by the decomposition a. For any $\delta > 0$, we let

$$H_\delta^\perp := e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} H^\perp e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}. \tag{3.40}$$

We show in Section 5 that E is in the resolvent set of $H_\delta^\perp$ and

$$\|(H_\delta^\perp - E)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1. \tag{3.41}$$

Our goal is to show

Lemma 3.3. *Assume* (3.41) *holds. Then there are σ_{ij} positive constants, independent of y and depending only on the nature of the atoms i and j, s.t.*

$$U(E) \doteq f(y)P, \quad \textit{where} \quad f(y) = \sum_{i<j}^{1,N} \frac{e^4 \sigma_{ij}}{|y_{ij}|^6}(1 + O(\frac{1}{R})). \tag{3.42}$$

Moreover, σ_{ij} are given by relations

$$\sigma_{ij} = \langle f_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j, (P_{ij}^{\perp}(H_{A_i} + H_{A_j})P_{ij}^{\perp} - E_i - E_j)^{-1} f_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j\rangle \tag{3.43}$$

where $f_{ij} := \sum_{k\in A_i, l\in A_j} f_{ij}^{kl}$.

Proof. We use (3.41) to estimate $U^{ab}(E)$ in (3.29). We claim that

$$U^{ab}(E) \doteq U^{aa}(E)\delta_{ab}(E) \quad \text{and independent of} \quad a \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}. \tag{3.44}$$

Indeed, using (3.8), (3.9) and (3.16), we obtain that

$$P^{\perp} I_a\Psi_a \doteq I_a\Psi_a, \qquad P^{\perp} I_b\Psi_b \doteq I_b\Psi_b. \tag{3.45}$$

This, together with (3.11), (3.29) and the relation

$$e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(H^{\perp} - E)^{-1} e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} = (H_{\delta}^{\perp} - E)^{-1}, \tag{3.46}$$

where $\delta > 0$, implies that we have that

$$\begin{aligned} U^{ab}(E) &\doteq \langle I_a\Psi_a, (H^{\perp} - E)^{-1} I_b\Psi_b\rangle & (3.47)\\ &\doteq \langle e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} I_a\Psi_a, (H_{\delta}^{\perp} - E)^{-1} e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} I_b\Psi_b\rangle. & (3.48) \end{aligned}$$

Due to (2.9), and the Laplacian boundedness of I_a we have for all $\delta < \theta$ that

$$\|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} I_a\Psi_a\| \lesssim 1 \quad \forall a. \tag{3.49}$$

In addition, by the construction of φ (see (3.39)) we have that $\varphi(x-y_k) \geq \min\{\langle x-y_k\rangle, R-1\}$. Using this and the triangle inequality $\langle x - y_a\rangle + \langle x - y_b\rangle \geq \langle y_a - y_b\rangle \geq R$ (since $a \neq b$), we obtain the inequality $\varphi(x - y_a) + \varphi(x - y_b) \geq R - 1$, which in turn implies

$$e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} \lesssim e^{-\delta R} e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_b)}. \tag{3.50}$$

Using the relations (3.41), (3.48), (3.49) and (3.50) we arrive at (3.44) $\forall a \neq b$.

Now we show the $a = b$ part of (3.44), i.e. the independence of a. First, recall that for any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ there exists a permutation π with $b = \pi a$ (this equality was defined precisely in (2.2)). Moreover, $T_\pi\Psi_a = \Psi_{\pi a}$. The last two facts imply that

$$T_\pi I_a\Psi_a = I_b\Psi_b.$$

Using (3.29), and the last relation we obtain that

$$U^{bb}(E) = \langle T_\pi I_a\Psi_a, P^{\perp}(H^{\perp} - E)^{-1} P^{\perp} T_\pi I_a\Psi_a\rangle.$$

Since H and P commute with T_π (see (1.7) and (3.12)) and since T_π is unitary, the last relation implies that $U^{bb}(E) = U^{aa}(E)$, i.e. the $a = b$ part of (3.44).

Thus it suffices to estimate $U^{aa}(E)$ for a fixed a. Recall the formula (3.17) ($I_a = \sum_{1=l<m}^{M} I_{A_l A_m}$, where $I_{A_l A_m}$ are the interactions between the atoms A_i and A_j). The estimates (3.32) and (3.33) imply that the terms $I_{A_i A_j}$, entering (3.17), satisfy the estimate

$$I_{A_i A_j}\Psi_a = \frac{e^2}{|y_{ij}|^3} f_{ij}(z, \widehat{y}_{ij})\Psi_a + O(\frac{1}{|y_{ij}|^4}), \tag{3.51}$$

where the remainder here is in the sense of the L^2 norm, $\widehat{y}_{ij} = \frac{y_{ij}}{|y_{ij}|}$, $z := (z_{li}, z_{mj},\ l \in A_i,\ m \in A_j)$ with the variables z_{li}, z_{mj}, defined in (3.19), and

$$f_{ij}(z, \widehat{y}_{ij}) = \sum_{k\in A_i, l\in A_j} (z_{ki} \cdot z_{lj} - 3(z_{ki} \cdot \widehat{y}_{ij})(z_{lj} \cdot \widehat{y}_{ij})). \tag{3.52}$$

We insert (3.17) with (3.51) into (3.47) with $b = a$ and use (3.38) to obtain

$$U^{aa}(E) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{e^4 \sigma^a_{\alpha,\beta}}{|y_\alpha|^3 |y_\beta|^3} + O(\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{e^4}{|y_\alpha|^3 |y_\beta|^4}), \tag{3.53}$$

where α, β run in pairs of nuclei in the decomposition a and

$$\sigma^a_{\alpha\beta} = \langle f_\alpha \Psi_a, (H^\perp - E)^{-1} f_\beta \Psi_a \rangle. \tag{3.54}$$

We prove in Section 6 that

$$|\sigma^a_{\alpha,\beta}| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}, \text{ if } \alpha \neq \beta, \tag{3.55}$$

and that

$$\sigma^a_{\alpha,\alpha} = \sigma_\alpha + O(\frac{1}{R}), \tag{3.56}$$

where σ_α, for $\alpha = (ij)$, are given in (3.43).

The relations (3.28), (3.44), (3.53), (3.55) and (3.56), together with (3.10), imply (3.42) modulo the fact that σ_{ij} are positive and independent of y which we prove below.

First we note that the only dependence of σ_{ij} on $\widehat{y_{ij}} := \frac{y_i - y_j}{|y_i - y_j|}$ appears on f_{ij} so we will write $f_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}}$ and $\sigma_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}}$. For any rotation R in $\mathbb{R}^3$ we define T_R acting on the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3(|A_i|+|A_j|)})$ (recall that $|A_k|$ is the number of electrons of the k-th atom) of functions of the variables $z_{kl} = x_k - y_l,\ k = 1, \ldots, |A_i| + |A_j|,\ l = 1, 2$, by rotating them. Since T_R commutes with $H_{A_i} + H_{A_j}$ and since $\phi_i \phi_j$ is a ground state of $H_{A_i} + H_{A_j}$, we have that $T_R \phi_i \phi_j$ is also a ground state of $H_{A_i} + H_{A_j}$. Therefore, since the ground state is non degenerate and T_R is unitary we obtain that $T_R \phi_i \phi_j = c(R) \phi_i \phi_j$ where $|c(R)| = 1$. This implies

$$T_R P_{ij}^\perp T_R^{-1} = P_{ij}^\perp.$$

Using the last relation and the fact that $H_{A_i} + H_{A_j}$ commutes with T_R, together with (3.43) and the fact that T_R is unitary, we obtain that

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}} = \langle T_{R^{-1}}(f_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}} \phi_i \phi_j), (P_{ij}^\perp (H_{A_i} + H_{A_j}) P_{ij}^\perp - E_i - E_j)^{-1} T_{R^{-1}}(f_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}} \phi_i \phi_j) \rangle. \tag{3.57}$$

On the other hand using (3.52) and the fact that R is unitary we obtain that

$$T_R^{-1} f_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}} = f_{ij}^{\widehat{R^{-1} y_{ij}}}. \tag{3.58}$$

But using that $T_R^{-1} \phi_i \phi_j = c(R^{-1}) \phi_i \phi_j$, with $|c(R^{-1})| = 1$, together with (3.58), we obtain that

$$T_{R^{-1}}(f_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}} \phi_i \phi_j) = c(R^{-1}) f_{ij}^{\widehat{R^{-1} y_{ij}}} \phi_i \phi_j.$$

The last relation together with (3.57) and $|c(R^{-1})| = 1$ implies that

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\widehat{y_{ij}}} = \langle f_{ij}^{\widehat{R^{-1}y_{ij}}}\phi_i\phi_j, (P_{ij}^{\perp}(H_{A_i} + H_{A_j})P_{ij}^{\perp} - E_i - E_j)^{-1}(f_{ij}^{\widehat{R^{-1}y_{ij}}}\phi_i\phi_j)\rangle = \sigma_{ij}^{\widehat{Ry_{ij}}},$$

which implies that σ_{ij} is independent of y_{ij}.

Thus, it remains to prove that $\sigma_{ij} > 0$. By (3.43) and the fact that $P_{ij}^{\perp}(H_{A_i} + H_{A_j})P_{ij}^{\perp} - E_i - E_j$ is a positive operator, we obtain that $\sigma_{ij} \geq 0$. Assume now that $\sigma_{ij} = 0$. Then since $(P_{ij}^{\perp}(H_{A_i} + H_{A_j})P_{ij}^{\perp} - E_i - E_j)^{-1} \geq 0$, we obtain that $f_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j$ is a minimizer of the quadratic form $\langle\Psi, (P_{ij}^{\perp}(H_{A_i} + H_{A_j})P_{ij}^{\perp} - E_i - E_j)^{-1}\Psi\rangle$ and therefore the Gateaux derivative vanishes at $f_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j$ or in other words $(P_{ij}^{\perp}(H_{A_i} + H_{A_j})P_{ij}^{\perp} - E_i - E_j)^{-1}f_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j = 0$. Applying $(P_{ij}^{\perp}(H_{A_i} + H_{A_j})P_{ij}^{\perp} - E_i - E_j)$ on both sides of the last relation we obtain that $f_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j = 0$, which contradicts the fact that $f_{ij}\phi_i\phi_j \neq 0$. □

3.6 Conclusion of the argument

From (3.1), (3.13) and (3.42) we have that

$$F_P(E) \doteq E(\infty) - f(y). \tag{3.59}$$

Since the ground state energy E is an eigenvalue of H, we conclude from (3.3), (3.59) and the definition $W(y) = E - E(\infty)$ that (1.4) holds. Therefore, we have proven the following result:

Theorem 3.4. *Assume Property (E). If the relations* (3.11), (3.41), (3.55) *and* (3.56) *hold, then so does the van der Waals law without statistics (Theorem 1.5).*

3.7 Proof of the necessity of Property (E)

In this section we will show that if Property (E) fails to hold then so does the van der Waals - London law. We denote by $\mathcal{A}^{\min}$ the set of all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $\inf \sigma(H_a) = E_{\min}$. If Property (E) holds if and only if $\mathcal{A}^{\min} = \mathcal{A}^{at}$. We now use the Feshbach map but with the orthogonal projection P onto

$$\mathrm{span}\{\Psi_a : a \in \mathcal{A}^{\min}\}.$$

Then proceeding as in the proof of (3.10) we can show that

$$P \doteq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^{\min}} |\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a|. \tag{3.60}$$

Furthermore, repeating the arguments of the proof of (3.11) (with $\mathcal{A}^{at}$ replacing $\mathcal{A}^{\min}$) we can prove that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $H^{\perp} \geq E_{min} + 2\gamma$, which implies that the Feshbach Schur method can be used.

We will now estimate PHP. Using (3.60) and proceeding as in the proof of (3.15), we can show that

$$PHP \doteq E_{\min}P + \sum_{a,c \in \mathcal{A}^{\min}} |\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a, I_c\Psi_c\rangle\langle\Psi_c|.$$

Due to exponential decay of the ground states and the result (3.16), we have that

$$\langle \Psi_a, I_c \Psi_c \rangle \doteq 0 \text{ when either } a \neq c \text{ or } a = c \in \mathcal{A}^{at}.$$

Since the Property (E) is not satisfied it means that there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}^{\min}$ with $a \notin \mathcal{A}^{at}$. For such a decomposition $a = (I_1, \dots, I_M)$, we define the charges $q_{ai} := (Z_i - |I_i|)e$. Next, we apply Newton's theorem (3.22) to show that

$$\langle \Psi_a, I_a \Psi_a \rangle \doteq \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{q_{ai} q_{aj}}{|y_i - y_j|}, \ , \ \forall a \notin \mathcal{A}^{at}.$$

Clearly, $\sum_{i \neq j} \frac{q_{ai} q_{aj}}{|y_{ai} - y_{aj}|} \asymp \frac{1}{R}$. The last three relations imply that

$$PHP \doteq E_{\min} P + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^{\min}/\mathcal{A}^{at}} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{q_{ai} q_{aj}}{|y_i - y_j|} |\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a|. \tag{3.61}$$

Now, we estimate $U(\lambda)$. Proceeding as in the proof of (3.28) we can obtain that

$$U(\lambda) \doteq \sum_{a,b \in \mathcal{A}^{\min}} |\Psi_a\rangle\langle I_a \Psi_a, P^{\perp}(H^{\perp} - \lambda)^{-1} P^{\perp} I_b \Psi_b\rangle\langle\Psi_b|.$$

In addition proceeding as in proving (3.51), we can show that

$$\|I_a \Psi_a\| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{3.62}$$

The last two relations together with $H^{\perp} \geq E_{min} + 2\gamma$, for $\gamma > 0$, give

$$U(\lambda) = O(\frac{1}{R^2}), \quad \forall \lambda \leq E_{\min} + \gamma. \tag{3.63}$$

The relations (3.1), (3.61) and (3.63) give that

$$F_P(\lambda) = E_{\min} P + \sum_{a,b \in \mathcal{A}^{\min}/\mathcal{A}^{at}} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{q_{ai} q_{aj}}{|y_i - y_j|} |\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a| + O(\frac{1}{R^2}), \quad \forall \lambda \leq E_{\min} + \gamma,$$

and therefore, by $\sum_{i \neq j} \frac{q_{ai} q_{aj}}{|y_i - y_j|} \asymp \frac{1}{R}$ and (3.3), the van der Waals law fails. As a consequence Property (E) is necessary for van der Waals law to hold.

4 Proof of stability bound (3.11) assuming Property (E)

Recall that the system we consider consists of M atoms with $Z_1, ..., Z_M$ electrons, respectively, and that E_m and $E_{m,n}$ denote the ground state energy of the atom m (corresponding to the m-th nucleus) and the ground state energy (the infimum of the spectrum) of the ion with a nucleus of charge eZ_m and $Z_m - n$ electrons, respectively. Let $E_j^{'}$ be the first excited state energy of the atom j and $E(\infty)$ as defined in (1.3). We define

$$\gamma_1 = \min\{E_j^{'} - E_j : j = 1, ..., M\}, \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\gamma_2 = \min\{(E_{1,n_1} + ... + E_{M,n_M}) - E(\infty)\}, \tag{4.2}$$

where the minimum is taken among all $n_1, ..., n_M \in \mathbb{Z}$, satisfying the constraints of Property (E). Due to (1.3) and Property (E) we have that $\gamma_2 > 0$. Finally, we let

$$\gamma_0 := \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} > 0. \tag{4.3}$$

The relation (3.11) will follow immediately from the following proposition:

Proposition 4.1. *$H^\perp \geq E(\infty) + \gamma_0 - \delta(R)$, where $\delta(R) \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$. In particular, (3.11) holds for R large enough.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{A}$ is the set of all decompositions, which correspond to all partitions $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\}$ of $\{1, ..., N\}$ with $|A_j| \geq 0$ for all j. Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ includes decompositions of the system with clusters that are possibly ions. We will split the configuration space $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ into domains. For each $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\} \in \mathcal{A}$, we define

$$\Omega_a^\beta = \{(x_1, ..., x_N) : |x_i - y_j| \geq \beta R, \forall j = 1, ..., M, \forall i \notin A_j\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Following [Sig] we will now construct a partition of unity $(J_a)_{a\in\mathcal{A}}$ having the properties:

$$0 \leq J_a \leq 1, \operatorname{supp} J_a \subset \Omega_a^{\frac{1}{5}}, \|\partial^\alpha J_a\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim R^{-|\alpha|}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$J_a \text{ commute with all elements of } S(a), \tag{4.6}$$

where, recall, $S(a)$ is the group of permutations that keeps the clusters of a invariant, for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} J_a^2 = 1. \tag{4.7}$$

We consider the functions $F_a = \chi_{\Omega_a^{\frac{3}{10}}} * \phi$ where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a C_c^∞ function supported in $B_{\frac{1}{10}}(0)$ (ball of radius $\frac{1}{10}$ centered at the origin) symmetric with respect to particle coordinates, with $\phi \geq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} \phi = 1$ and χ_A denotes the characteristic function of the set A. Then $F_a \in C^\infty$ and $F_a \geq 0$. Furthermore using the triangle inequality and the fact that ϕ is supported in $B_{\frac{1}{10}}(\vec{0})$ we obtain that $\operatorname{supp}(F_a) \subset \Omega_a^{\frac{1}{5}}$ and that $F_a|_{\Omega_a^{\frac{2}{5}}} = 1$. The last relation together with the fact that $\cup_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\Omega_a^{\frac{2}{5}} = \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ gives that $\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} F_a \geq 1$. Therefore, if we define

$$J_a = \frac{F_a}{\sqrt{\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} F_a^2}},$$

then J_a is a partition of unity satisfying all the desired properties.

Now we use the IMS localization formula (see for example [CFKS])

$$H = \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \left(J_a H J_a - |\nabla J_a|^2\right). \tag{4.8}$$

This together with (4.5) gives that $H \geq \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} J_a H J_a - \frac{C}{R}$. The last relation together with (2.5) and $I_a \geq -\sum_{j=1}^{M}\sum_{i=1,i\notin A_j}^{N} \frac{e^2 Z_j}{|x_i-y_j|} \geq -\frac{C}{R}$ on $\operatorname{supp} J_a$ implies that

$$H \geq \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} J_a H_a J_a - \frac{C}{R}. \tag{4.9}$$

The last relation together with the fact that $P^{\perp}$ is self-adjoint and $P^{\perp} \leq 1$ implies that

$$P^{\perp} H P^{\perp} \geq \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} P^{\perp} J_a H_a J_a P^{\perp} - \frac{C}{R}. \tag{4.10}$$

We will now estimate each of the terms on the right hand side of (4.10).

Lemma 4.2. *With γ_0 defined in* (4.3)*, we have that, $\forall a \in \mathcal{A}$,*

$$P^{\perp} J_a H_a J_a P^{\perp} \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_0) P^{\perp} J_a^2 P^{\perp} - \frac{C}{R}. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. We will consider the following two cases

Case (1): $a \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}^{at}$ (i.e. some clusters of the decomposition a include ions).

In this case we define $n_j := Z_j - |A_j|$. Since by definition E_{j,n_j} is the infimum of the spectrum of the hamiltonian H_{A_j}, defined in (2.4), we have that $H_{A_j} \geq E_{j,n_j}$. The last relation together with (4.2), (4.3) and (2.3) gives that

$$H_a \geq E_{1,n_1} + \ldots + E_{M,n_M} \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_0)$$

and as a consequence

$$P^{\perp} J_a H_a J_a P^{\perp} \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_0) P^{\perp} J_a^2 P^{\perp}. \tag{4.12}$$

Case (2): $a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ (i.e. a is a decomposition of the system to M (neutral) atoms). Now, let

$$P_a = |\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a|, \tag{4.13}$$

where recall that Ψ_a is the ground state of H_a. Using $(P^{\perp} - P_a^{\perp}) J_a H_a = (P_a - P) J_a H_a$, (3.8), (4.13) and the self-adjointness of J_a and H_a, we obtain that

$$(P^{\perp} - P_a^{\perp}) J_a H_a = |\Psi_a\rangle\langle H_a J_a \Psi_a| - \sum_{d,b\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_d\rangle g^{db} \langle H_a J_a \Psi_b|. \tag{4.14}$$

We will now prove that

$$\|H_a J_a \Psi_b\| \doteq 0, \quad \forall a,b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, a \neq b. \tag{4.15}$$

Indeed, by the Laplacian boundedness of the Coulomb potential we have that

$$\|H_a J_a \Psi_b\| \lesssim \|J_a \Psi_b\| + \|\Delta(J_a \Psi_b)\|. \tag{4.16}$$

Since J_a is supported on $\Omega_a^{\frac{1}{5}}$, by (4.4) and (4.5) we obtain that

$$|\partial^{\alpha} J_a| e^{-\theta\langle x-y_b\rangle} \leq |\partial^{\alpha} J_a| e^{-\frac{\theta R}{5}} \leq e^{-\frac{\theta R}{5}}, \tag{4.17}$$

where θ is the same as in (2.9). The relations (4.17) and (2.9) imply that

$$\|\partial^\alpha J_a \partial^\beta \Psi_b\| \doteq 0.$$

which together with (4.16) implies (4.15). The latter inequality and (4.14) yield

$$\|(P^\perp - P_a^\perp) J_a H_a\| \doteq 0. \tag{4.18}$$

Similarly we show that $\|H_a J_a (P^\perp - P_a^\perp)\| \doteq 0$, which gives

$$P^\perp J_a H_a J_a P^\perp \doteq P_a^\perp J_a H_a J_a P_a^\perp. \tag{4.19}$$

Next, using the relation $P_a^\perp J_a = J_a P_a^\perp + [P_a^\perp, J_a] = J_a P_a^\perp - [P_a, J_a]$, we obtain that

$$P_a^\perp J_a H_a J_a P_a^\perp = J_a P_a^\perp H_a P_a^\perp J_a + [J_a, P_a] H_a J_a P_a^\perp + J_a P_a^\perp H_a [P_a, J_a].$$

Since $P_a = |\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a|$ and H_a is self-adjoint we have that

$$[J_a, P_a] H_a = |J_a \Psi_a\rangle\langle H_a \Psi_a| - |\Psi_a\rangle\langle H_a J_a \Psi_a|.$$

Using now that $H_a \Psi_a = E(\infty)\Psi_a$ and $H_a J_a \Psi_a = E(\infty) J_a \Psi_a + [H_a, J_a]\Psi_a$ and the relation (4.5), we obtain that

$$[J_a, P_a] H_a = E(\infty)(|(J_a - 1)\Psi_a\rangle\langle\Psi_a| - |\Psi_a\rangle\langle(J_a - 1)\Psi_a|) + O(\frac{1}{R}).$$

(Our definition of J_a (see the paragraph after (4.7)) implies that $|\partial^\alpha \Psi_a| \lesssim e^{-cR}$ on $\operatorname{supp} \nabla J_a$ so that the error above is in fact $O(e^{-cR})$). By (2.9), we obtain that

$$\|(1 - J_a)\Psi_a\| = \|(1 - J_a) e^{-\theta\langle x - y_a\rangle}\|_{L^\infty} \|e^{\theta\langle x - y_a\rangle}\Psi_a\| \lesssim \|(1 - J_a) e^{-\theta\langle x - y_a\rangle}\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Using the relations $0 \le 1 - J_a \le 1 - J_a^2$ and (4.7), we find that $(1 - J_a) \le \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}, b \ne a} J_b^2$. Now, since by (4.5), $\langle x - y_a\rangle \ge \frac{R}{5}$ on the support of J_b for all $b \ne a$, we obtain that

$$0 \le \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}, b \ne a} J_b^2 e^{-\theta\langle x - y_a\rangle} \le \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}, b \ne a} J_b^2 e^{-\theta\frac{R}{5}} \le e^{-\theta\frac{R}{5}}, \tag{4.20}$$

where in the last step we used (4.7). The last three relations give

$$\|(1 - J_a)\Psi_a\| \doteq 0. \tag{4.21}$$

This shows

$$\|[J_a, P_a] H_a\| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}. \tag{4.22}$$

The relation $\|H_a [P_a, J_a]\| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}$ can be shown similarly, which implies

$$P_a^\perp J_a H_a J_a P_a^\perp \ge J_a P_a^\perp H_a P_a^\perp J_a - \frac{C}{R}. \tag{4.23}$$

Now, if $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\}$ then by (2.6) we can write $P_a = \prod_{j=1}^M P_{A_j}$ where P_{A_j} is the orthogonal projection onto the function ϕ_{A_j} defined in (2.7). Since for all $j = 1, ..., M$ we have that P_{A_j} commutes with H_a and $P^\perp_{A_j}P_{A_j} = P_{A_j}P^\perp_{A_j} = 0$ and $P^\perp_a = \sum_{j=1}^M (P^\perp_{A_j}\prod_{i=j+1}^M P_{A_i})$, we obtain that

$$P^\perp_a H_a P^\perp_a = \sum_{j=1}^M (P^\perp_{A_j}(\prod_{i=j+1}^M P_{A_i})H_a P^\perp_{A_j}(\prod_{i=j+1}^M P_{A_i})).$$

The last relation together with the relation (2.3) for the decomposition a gives that

$$P^\perp_a H_a P^\perp_a = \sum_{l=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M ((\prod_{i=j+1}^M P_{A_i})P^\perp_{A_j}H_{A_l}P^\perp_{A_j}(\prod_{i=j+1}^M P_{A_i})).$$

Since all the projections on the right hand side commute and $H_{A_l} \geq E_l$ (recall that E_l is the ground state energy of the atom corresponding to the nucleus l) and $P^\perp_{A_l}H_{A_l}P^\perp_{A_l} \geq (E_l+\gamma_1)P^\perp_{A_l}$ (by the definition of γ_1 in (4.1) and the fact that $P^\perp_{A_l}$ removes the ground state energy from the spectrum of H_{A_l}), we obtain that

$$P^\perp_a H_a P^\perp_a \geq \sum_{j=1}^M (\prod_{i=j+1}^M P_{A_i})P^\perp_{A_j}(E(\infty)+\gamma_1) = P^\perp_a(E(\infty)+\gamma_1).$$

The last relation together with (4.3) completes the proof of

$$J_a P^\perp_a H_a P^\perp_a J_a \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_0)J_a P^\perp_a J_a. \tag{4.24}$$

Using that $(P^\perp_a)^2 = P^\perp_a$ and that $[P^\perp_a, J_a] = -[P_a, J_a]$ we obtain that

$$J_a P^\perp_a J_a = J_a(P^\perp_a)^2 J_a = P^\perp_a J_a^2 P^\perp_a + [P_a, J_a]P^\perp_a J_a - P^\perp_a J_a[P_a, J_a]$$

The last relation together $\|[P_a, J_a]\| \leq \frac{1}{R}$, which can be proven similarly to (4.22), give that

$$J_a P^\perp_a J_a \leq P^\perp_a J_a^2 P^\perp_a + \frac{C}{R}. \tag{4.25}$$

Proceeding as in the proof of (4.18) we can obtain that

$$\|(P-P_a)J_a\|, \|J_a(P-P_a)\| \doteq 0. \tag{4.26}$$

The relations (4.25) and (4.26) imply

$$J_a P^\perp_a J_a \leq P^\perp J_a^2 P^\perp + \frac{C}{R}. \tag{4.27}$$

Finally, by (1.3), (4.1) and (4.3) we have that

$$E(\infty)+\gamma_0 < E'_1 + E_2 + ... + E_M.$$

Using the last relation and the fact that the ground state and first excited state of every atom is always negative we obtain

$$E(\infty)+\gamma_0 < 0. \tag{4.28}$$

Equations (4.19), (4.23), (4.24), (4.27) and (4.28) imply (4.11). This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

Equations (4.7), (4.10) and (4.11) give that $H^\perp \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_0)P^\perp - \frac{C}{R}$, which together with $P^\perp \leq 1$ and (4.28) gives that $H^\perp \geq E(\infty)+\gamma_0 - \frac{C}{R}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.1 and therefore of (3.11). □

5 Proof of (3.41)

The proof consists of two lemmas. Recall that $E = E(y)$ is the ground state energy of H and $\Delta = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Delta_{x_j}$. We will often use the bound

$$\|(1-\Delta)(H_{\#}+C)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1, \tag{5.1}$$

where $H_{\#}$ is one of the Schrödinger operators which appear in the proof and C is such that $H_{\#}+C \geq 1$. This bound follows from the fact that the Coulomb potential is bounded relative to Laplacian with the relative bound zero. For any operator K and $\delta > 0$, we let

$$K_\delta := e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} K e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)},\ K_\delta^\perp := (K^\perp)_\delta. \tag{5.2}$$

Lemma 5.1. *We have that*

$$\|(H_\delta - H)(1-\Delta)^{-1}\| \lesssim \delta. \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$H_\delta - H = -\Delta_\delta + \Delta. \tag{5.4}$$

Since $\Delta_\delta = e^{\delta\varphi}\Delta e^{-\delta\varphi}$, where φ was defined in (3.39), by the Leibnitz rule we obtain that

$$-\Delta_\delta + \Delta = \delta[(\Delta\varphi) + (\nabla\varphi)\cdot\nabla - \delta|\nabla\varphi|^2].$$

Since φ by definition has L^∞ bounded derivatives this implies that $[(\Delta\varphi)+(\nabla\varphi)\cdot\nabla-\delta|\nabla\varphi|^2]$ is $-\Delta$ bounded. Hence, we obtain (5.3). □

Lemma 5.2. *The following relations hold for small δ:*

$$\|P_\delta - P\| \lesssim \delta \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\|H_\delta(P_\delta - P)\| \lesssim \delta. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Since, by (3.8), $P = \sum_{b,c\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|$, we have that

$$P_\delta - P = \sum_{b,c\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} \Big((|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c| \Big). \tag{5.7}$$

We show that

$$\|(|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|\| \lesssim \delta. \tag{5.8}$$

We start first with the case $b \neq c$. Let

$$g(\delta) = e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|.$$

Then $g(0) = 0$ and

$$g'(\delta) = -\varphi(x-y_a)e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}$$

$$+e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|\varphi(x-y_a)e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}$$

Using now that $0 \leq \varphi(x-y_a) \leq R$ and $|g^{bc}| \lesssim e^{-(CR)}$ (because of (3.9) and the fact that $b \neq c$), we obtain that

$$\|g'(\delta)\| \lesssim 2Re^{(\delta-C)R}\|\Psi_b\|\|\Psi_c\|.$$

As a consequence for δ small enough we obtain that $\|g'(\delta)\| \lesssim 1$ and since $g(0)=0$ we obtain that $\|g(\delta)\| \lesssim \delta$. This shows (5.8) for $b \neq c$. We now consider the case $b=c$.

Since $g^{bb} \doteq 1$ it is enough to show that

$$\|(|\Psi_b\rangle\langle\Psi_b|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle\langle\Psi_b|\| \lesssim \delta. \tag{5.9}$$

Since $|\Psi_b\rangle\langle\Psi_b|$ (recall $E(\infty)$ is the ground state energy of H_b) is a Riesz projection of H_b we have that

$$|\Psi_b\rangle\langle\Psi_b| = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_\Gamma (H_b-z)^{-1}dz, \tag{5.10}$$

where Γ is a circle around the ground state energy of H_b in the complex plane with radius equal to half of the distance between the first excited state energy and the ground state energy of H_b. Therefore,

$$(|\Psi_b\rangle\langle\Psi_b|)_\delta = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_\Gamma ((H_b-z)^{-1})_\delta dz = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_\Gamma (H_{b\delta}-z)^{-1}, \tag{5.11}$$

where $H_{b\delta} = (H_b)_\delta$.

Now, we estimate the difference of the resolvents in (5.10) and (5.11). The relations (5.1) and (5.3) imply that

$$\|(H_b - H_{b\delta})(H_b-z)^{-1}\| \lesssim \delta. \tag{5.12}$$

This and the second resolvent formula

$$(H_{b\delta}-z)^{-1} = (H_b-z)^{-1} + (H_{b\delta}-z)^{-1}(H_b-H_{b\delta})(H_b-z)^{-1}. \tag{5.13}$$

imply that, for δ sufficiently small,

$$\|(H_{b\delta}-z)^{-1} - (H_b-z)^{-1}\| \lesssim \delta\|(H_{b\delta}-z)^{-1}\|. \tag{5.14}$$

This together with the triangle inequality gives that for δ sufficiently small $\|(H_{b\delta}-z)^{-1}\| \leq 2\|(H_b-z)^{-1}\|$, which together with the previous relation implies that for δ small enough

$$\|(H_{b\delta}-z)^{-1} - (H_b-z)^{-1}\| \lesssim \delta\|(H_b-z)^{-1}\|. \tag{5.15}$$

Since any $z \in \Gamma$ is in the resolvent of H_b we have that $\|(H_b-z)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$ which with (5.15) (5.10) and (5.11) implies (5.9). This completes the proof of (5.8). (5.5) follows immediately from (5.7) and (5.8).

To prove (5.6) we observe that similarly to (5.7) we have

$$\|H_\delta(P_\delta - P)\| \leq \sum_{b,c\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} \|H_\delta\left((|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|\right)\|.$$

Let $d>0$ be a constant such that $d+H_b \geq 1 > 0$. Inserting $(d+H_b)^{-1}(d+H_b)$ into each summand and using that $\|H_\delta(d+H_b)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$, by (5.1) and (5.3), we obtain that

$$\|H_\delta(P_\delta - P)\| \lesssim \sum_{b,c\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} \|(d+H_b)\left((|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|\right)\|. \tag{5.16}$$

Applying the Leibnitz rule and using that $H_b\Psi_b = E(\infty)\Psi_b$ and the triangle inequality we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(d+H_b)\Big((|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c\Big)\| \\ \leq &\|\Big((d+E(\infty))(|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c\Big)\| \\ &+\||\nabla(e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)})\cdot\nabla\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\| \\ &+\|\Delta(e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)})|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

for all $b, c \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$. Using that, by (3.39), $\varphi(x-y_a) \geq \min\{R-1, \langle x-y_a\rangle\}$, and using the triangle inequality for the bracket $\langle\cdot\rangle$ and $\langle y_a - y_b\rangle \geq R$, we obtain that

$$\varphi(x-y_a) + \langle x-y_b\rangle \geq R-1,$$

which, together with the exponential bounds (2.9) on $\nabla^n\Psi_b$, $n = 0, 1, 2$ implies that, for $\delta \leq \theta/2$,

$$\|\langle x-y_a\rangle^m e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\nabla^n\Psi_b\| \lesssim e^{-\delta(R-1)}, \quad n = 1, 2.$$

Furthermore, since $\varphi(x-y_a) \leq R$, we have $\|\Psi_c e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\| \lesssim e^{\delta R}$. The last two relations give

$$\||\nabla^n(e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)})\cdot\nabla^m\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\| \lesssim \delta, \quad n \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq m \leq 2. \tag{5.18}$$

The latter equation together with (5.8), (5) and (5.18) implies

$$\|(d+H_b)\Big((|\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c|)_\delta - |\Psi_b\rangle g^{bc}\langle\Psi_c\Big)\|| \lesssim \delta, \tag{5.19}$$

for all $b, c \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$. This together with (5.16) gives (5.6). □

Now, we prove (3.41), i.e. $\|(H_\delta^\perp - E)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$. We use the decomposition $H_\delta^\perp - E = H^\perp - E + (H_\delta^\perp - H^\perp)$ and that, by (3.38), we have that

$$\|(H^\perp - E)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1. \tag{5.20}$$

Pulling $(H^\perp - E)$ out, we obtain that

$$H_\delta^\perp - E = (I + (H_\delta^\perp - H^\perp)(H^\perp - E)^{-1})(H^\perp - E). \tag{5.21}$$

We show that $(I + (H_\delta^\perp - H^\perp)(H^\perp - E)^{-1})$ is invertible and estimate its inverse. First, since $H^\perp := P^\perp H P^\perp$ and $H_\delta^\perp := (H^\perp)_\delta$ and $(P_\delta^\perp - P^\perp) = P - P_\delta$, we obtain that

$$H_\delta^\perp - H^\perp = -P_\delta^\perp H_\delta(P_\delta - P) + P_\delta^\perp(H_\delta - H)P^\perp - (P_\delta - P)HP^\perp. \tag{5.22}$$

Next, we observe that by (5.1) and (5.3),

$$\|(H_\delta - H)(H-E)^{-1}\| \lesssim \|(H_\delta - H)(1-\Delta)^{-1}\| \lesssim \delta. \tag{5.23}$$

This, together with (5.6) and (5.5) and $\|HP^\perp(1-\Delta)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$ and $\|(1-\Delta)P^\perp(1-\Delta)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$, gives that

$$\|(H_\delta^\perp - H^\perp)(1-\Delta)^{-1}\| \lesssim \delta, \tag{5.24}$$

which for δ small enough yields $\|(H_\delta^\perp - H^\perp)(H^\perp - E)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. This shows that $(I + (H_\delta^\perp - H^\perp)(H^\perp - E)^{-1})$ is invertible and its inverse is bounded by 2, which together with (5.20) gives, for δ small enough, the relation (3.41).

6 Proof of (3.55) and (3.56)

Recall that $E(\infty) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} E_j$ is the sum of the ground states of the atoms. The definition (3.54) of $\sigma^a_{\alpha\beta}$, the relation $H = H_a + I_a$ and the second resolvent formula,

$$(H^\perp - E)^{-1} = (H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} - (H^\perp - E)^{-1}(I_a^\perp - E + E(\infty))(H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1}, \quad (6.1)$$

where $H_a^\perp := P^\perp H_a P^\perp$, give that

$$\sigma^a_{\alpha\beta} = D - G, \quad (6.2)$$

where

$$D := \langle f_\alpha \Psi_a, (H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} f_\beta \Psi_a\rangle. \quad (6.3)$$

and

$$G := \langle f_\alpha \Psi_a, (H^\perp - E)^{-1}(I_a^\perp - E + E(\infty))(H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} f_\beta \Psi_a\rangle. \quad (6.4)$$

We will show first that

$$|G| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}. \quad (6.5)$$

By (3.26) we have that $|E - E(\infty)| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^6}$ which together with (6.4) and the fact that $P^\perp$ commutes with $(H^\perp - E)^{-1}$ and $(H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1}$ yields that

$$G = \langle P^\perp(f_\alpha \Psi_a), (H^\perp - E)^{-1} I_a (H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} P^\perp(f_\beta \Psi_a)\rangle + O(\frac{1}{R^6}), \quad (6.6)$$

Now, by (3.10) and (2.9), we have that $P(f_\alpha \Psi_a) \doteq \Psi_a\langle \Psi_a, f_\alpha \Psi_a\rangle$. But since by (3.52) f_α for say $\alpha = (mn)$ is odd in the variables $z_{sm} := x_s - y_m$ for any $s \in A_m$ and $|\Psi_a|^2$ is even in the same variables we obtain that $\langle \Psi_a, f_\alpha \Psi_a\rangle = 0$ and therefore $P(f_\alpha \Psi_a) \doteq 0$, which, together with $P^\perp = 1 - P$, gives in turn

$$P^\perp(f_\alpha \Psi_a) \doteq f_\alpha \Psi_a, \quad (6.7)$$

for any pair α. The relations (6.6) and (6.7) and the boundedness of $I_a(H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1}$ yield that

$$G = \langle f_\alpha \Psi_a, (H^\perp - E)^{-1} I_a (H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} f_\beta \Psi_a\rangle + O(\frac{1}{R^6}). \quad (6.8)$$

Inserting $e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}$, where recall that φ was defined in (3.39), into two places in (6.8) and using that $e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(H^\perp - E)^{-1}e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} = (H_\delta^\perp - E)^{-1}$, where recall $H_\delta^\perp := e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}H^\perp e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}$ (see (3.46)), we obtain that

$$G = \langle e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} f_\alpha \Psi_a, (H_\delta^\perp - E)^{-1} \chi f_\beta \Psi_a\rangle + O(\frac{1}{R^6}), \quad (6.9)$$

where

$$\chi = e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} I_a (H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1}. \quad (6.10)$$

By (2.9) we have for $\delta < \frac{\theta}{2}$ that

$$\|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)} f_\alpha \Psi_a\| \lesssim 1. \quad (6.11)$$

By (6.10) and the triangle inequality we have that

$$\|\chi\| \leq \|e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\chi_{\langle x-y_a\rangle \leq \frac{R}{3}} I_a (H_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1}\|$$

$$\|e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\chi_{\langle x-y_a\rangle\geq\frac{R}{3}}I_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}\|. \tag{6.12}$$

When $\langle x-y_a\rangle\leq\frac{R}{3}$ the electrons are close to the corresponding nuclei and therefore since I_a has interaction terms between different atoms we have that $|I_a|\lesssim\frac{1}{R}$. Therefore,

$$\|e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\chi_{\langle x-y_a\rangle\leq\frac{R}{3}}I_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}\|\lesssim\frac{1}{R}. \tag{6.13}$$

On the other hand by $H_a^\perp$ boundedness of I_a we have that $\|I_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}\|\lesssim 1$ and since

$$\|e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\chi_{\langle x-y_a\rangle\geq\frac{R}{3}}\|_{L^\infty}\leq e^{-cR},$$

(because $\varphi(x-y_a)\geq\frac{R}{3}$ when $\langle x-y_a\rangle\geq\frac{R}{3}$), we obtain that

$$\|e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\chi_{\langle x-y_a\rangle\geq\frac{R}{3}}I_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}\|\lesssim e^{-cR}. \tag{6.14}$$

Relations (6.12), (6.13) and (6.14) imply $\|\chi\|\lesssim O(\frac{1}{R})$. which, together with (6.9), (6.11) and (3.41), yields (6.5).

Now, let P_a be the orthogonal projection onto Ψ_a. We show

$$D\doteq\langle f_\alpha\Psi_a,(P_a^\perp H_aP_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}f_\beta\Psi_a\rangle. \tag{6.15}$$

Using the second resolvent formula we obtain that $D=\langle f_\alpha\Psi_a,(P_a^\perp H_aP_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}f_\beta\Psi_a\rangle+E$, where

$$E:=\langle f_\alpha\Psi_a,(P_a^\perp H_aP_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}(P_a^\perp H_aP_a^\perp-P^\perp H_aP^\perp)(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}f_\beta\Psi_a\rangle.$$

Using that $P_a^\perp$ commutes with H_a and that $H_aP^\perp(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}f_\beta\Psi_a\doteq H_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}f_\beta\Psi_a$ (following from the fact that $P^\perp$ commutes with $(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}$ and from (6.7)) and $P_a^\perp-P^\perp=P-P_a$, we obtain that

$$E\doteq\langle f_\alpha\Psi_a,(P_a^\perp H_aP_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}(P-P_a)H_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}f_\beta\Psi_a\rangle.$$

Inserting $e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}$ twice in the last relation we obtain that

$$E\doteq\langle e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}f_\alpha\Psi_a,e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(P_a^\perp H_aP_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\chi_1\rangle, \tag{6.16}$$

where

$$\chi_1=e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(P-P_a)H_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}f_\beta\Psi_a. \tag{6.17}$$

Now we will estimate the terms on the right hand side of (6.16). By (2.9) we have

$$\|e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}f_\alpha\Psi_a\|\lesssim 1. \tag{6.18}$$

Also proceeding similarly to the proof of (3.41), we obtain

$$\|e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(P_a^\perp H_aP_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}\|\lesssim 1. \tag{6.19}$$

Now we will estimate χ_1. Since $H_a=H_a^\perp+H_aP+PH_a+PH_aP$ and the operators H_aP, PH_a, PH_aP are bounded we obtain that

$$\|H_a(H_a^\perp-E(\infty))^{-1}\|\lesssim 1. \tag{6.20}$$

Also using (3.10) and (2.9), we obtain that

$$e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(P-P_a) \doteq \sum_{b\in\mathcal{A}^{at},b\neq a} e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}|\Psi_b\rangle\langle\Psi_b| \doteq 0. \tag{6.21}$$

The last two relations and (6.17) give that $\|\chi_1\| \doteq 0$. This relation and relations (6.16), (6.18) and (6.19) imply $E \doteq 0$, which gives (6.15).

We will now consider the first term on the r.h.s. of (6.15). Consider an atomic decomposition $a = \{A_1, ..., A_M\}$ and let $\alpha = ij, \beta = kl$. Recall that the atomic hamiltonians H_{A_i} and eigenfuctions ϕ_{A_i} were defined in (2.4) and (2.7), respectively, and recall that E_i denote the ground state energy of the atom A_i, so that (omitting identities) $H_a = \sum_i H_{A_i}$ and $\Psi_a = \prod_i \phi_{A_i}$ (see (2.3) and (2.6)). Let $P_i = |\phi_{A_i}\rangle\langle\phi_{A_i}|$, the orthogonal projection on ϕ_{A_i}, and $P_{ij} = P_i \otimes P_j$ and $P^{ij} = \prod_{k\neq i,j} P_k$. Without changing the notation we consider the operators P_k, P_{kl} and P^{kl} on the entire Hilbert space of the system and, abusing the notation, write the orthogonal projection P_a on P_a as $P_a = P_{kl} \otimes P^{kl}$. With these notation, we have $P_a^\perp P^{kl} = P_{kl}^\perp \otimes P^{kl}$ and therefore, on the invariant subspace $\operatorname{Ran} P^{kl}$,

$$P_a^\perp H_a P_a^\perp = H_{kl}^\perp + \sum_{i\neq k,l} E_i, \tag{6.22}$$

where $H_{kl}^\perp = P_{kl}^\perp (H_{A_k} + H_{A_l}) P_{kl}^\perp$. This and the relation $f_{kl}\Psi_a = P^{kl} f_{kl}\Psi_a$ give

$$(P_a^\perp H_a P_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} f_{kl}\Psi_a = (P_{kl}^\perp (H_{kl}^\perp - E_k - E_l)^{-1} P_{kl}^\perp f_{kl}\Psi_a, \tag{6.23}$$

which implies

$$\langle f_\alpha \Psi_a, (P_a^\perp H_a P_a^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} f_\beta \Psi_a\rangle = W, \tag{6.24}$$

where

$$W = \langle f_{ij}\Psi_a, (P_{kl}^\perp (H_{A_k} + H_{A_l}) P_{kl}^\perp - E_k - E_l)^{-1} f_{kl}\Psi_a\rangle. \tag{6.25}$$

We now prove that $W = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } ij \neq kl \\ \sigma_{ij}, & \text{if } ij = kl \end{cases}$, where σ_{ij} are given in (3.43). If $ij \neq kl$, then we may assume without loss of generality that $i \neq k, l$. Observing that the inner product on the right hand side of (6.25) reduces to an integral that is odd in $z_{mi}, m \in A_i$ we obtain $W = 0$ for $ij \neq kl$. For the case $ij = kl$, $W = \sigma_{ij}$ follows immediately from the relations (2.6) - (2.7) and the fact that the ground states of the atoms are normalized. This, together with (6.2), (6.5), (6.15), (6.24) and (6.25), proves the relations (3.55) and (3.56).

7 Proof of Theorem 1.2

7.1 The general set-up in the case of statistics

We begin with the general setup for the proof of Theorem 1.2. We will follow closely Section 4.

Let S_N denote the permutation group of $\{1, 2, ..., N\}$. We consider the representation $T : S_N \to U(L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}))$, where $U(L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}))$, denotes the unitary operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$ defined by the relation

$$(T_\pi\psi)(x_1, ..., x_N) = \psi(x_{\pi^{-1}(1)}, x_{\pi^{-1}(2)}, ..., x_{\pi^{-1}(N)}). \tag{7.1}$$

We label by σ the types of the irreducible representations of T. Let $\mathcal{H}^\sigma$ be the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$ on which the representation T is a multiple to the irreducible representation of type σ. Then

$$L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}) = \oplus_\sigma \mathcal{H}^\sigma. \tag{7.2}$$

Let χ_g^σ denote the character of the representation of type σ evaluated at g. The orthogonal projection of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$ onto $\mathcal{H}^\sigma$ is given by

$$Q^\sigma = \frac{\chi_{id}^\sigma}{N!} \sum_{\pi \in S_N} \chi_{\pi^{-1}}^\sigma T_\pi, \tag{7.3}$$

(see [Ha]). Since H commutes with any T_π, by (7.3), so it does with Q^σ,

$$HQ^\sigma = Q^\sigma H. \tag{7.4}$$

Hence $\mathcal{H}^\sigma$ is an invariant space of H. Let H^σ be the restriction of H onto $\mathcal{H}^\sigma$. We now denote the ground state energy of the system for the irreducible representation σ by

$$E^\sigma(y) = \inf \sigma(H^\sigma).$$

We repeat some definitions from the introduction. Fix an irreducible representation $T_{S_N}^\sigma$ of type σ of the permutation S_N. Let $S(a)$ be the subgroup of the permutation group S_N that keeps the clusters of the decomposition a invariant. Then the restriction $T_{S_N}^\sigma|_{S(a)}$ of the representation of S_N of type σ is not necessarily irreducible. Therefore, there exists a family, I^σ, of irreducible representations of $S(a)$ such that

$$T_{S_N}^\sigma|_{S(a)} = \oplus_{\alpha \in I^\sigma} T_{S(a)}^\alpha.$$

The representations $\alpha \in I^\sigma$ are called induced representations and we write $\alpha \prec \sigma$. The corresponding decomposition a will always be clear from the context.

We denote by Q_a^α the orthogonal projection onto the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$ on which the representation of $S(a)$ is a multiple to the irreducible representation of the type α. By [Ha] it can be written as

$$Q_a^\alpha = \frac{\chi_{id}^\alpha}{\#S(a)} \sum_{g \in S(a)} \chi_{g^{-1}}^\alpha T_g, \tag{7.5}$$

where $\#S(a)$ is the cardinality of $S(a)$. Since H_a commutes with all permutations in $S(a)$, it commutes with Q_a^α. We denote by H_a^α the restriction of H_a onto $\operatorname{Ran} Q_a^\alpha$.

We write $\alpha \prec\prec \sigma$ if $\alpha \prec \sigma$ and $\inf \sigma(H_a^\alpha) = \min_{b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \beta \prec \sigma} \inf \sigma(H_b^\beta)$. Let

$$E^\sigma(\infty) := \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \alpha \prec\prec \sigma} \inf \sigma(H_a^\alpha). \tag{7.6}$$

Let P_a^α be the orthogonal projection onto the ground state eigenspace of H_a^α and P^σ be the orthogonal projection onto the subspace

$$\operatorname{span}\{\operatorname{Ran} P_a^\alpha | a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \alpha \prec\prec \sigma\}.$$

We show below that P^σ commutes with T_π, for any $\pi \in S_N$, and therefore with Q^σ and $\operatorname{Ran} P^\sigma \cap \operatorname{Ran} Q^\sigma \neq \{0\}$. Since P^σ and Q^σ commute, the operator

$$\Pi^\sigma := P^\sigma Q^\sigma = Q^\sigma P^\sigma, \tag{7.7}$$

is the orthogonal projection on $\operatorname{Ran} P^\sigma \cap \operatorname{Ran} Q^\sigma \neq \varnothing$ and satisfies

$$\Pi^\sigma Q^\sigma = Q^\sigma \Pi^\sigma = \Pi^\sigma. \tag{7.8}$$

We now consider the Feshbach map, $F_{\Pi^\sigma}(\lambda)$, where Π^σ is defined in (7.7), as defined in (3.1) - (3.2), i.e.

$$F_{\Pi^\sigma}(\lambda) = \left[\Pi^\sigma H \Pi^\sigma - \Pi^\sigma H \Pi^{\sigma\perp}(\Pi^{\sigma\perp} H \Pi^{\sigma\perp} - \lambda)^{-1}\Pi^{\sigma\perp} H \Pi^\sigma\right]|_{\operatorname{Ran}\Pi^\sigma}, \tag{7.9}$$

with, as above, $\Pi^{\sigma\perp} = 1 - \Pi^\sigma$. Since H and P^σ commute with Q^σ, we have that

$$F_{\Pi^\sigma}(\lambda) = [P^\sigma H^\sigma P^\sigma - U^\sigma(\lambda)]\,\big|_{\operatorname{Ran}\Pi^\sigma}, \tag{7.10}$$

where

$$U^\sigma(\lambda) = P^\sigma H^\sigma P^{\sigma\perp}(H^{\sigma\perp} - \lambda)^{-1} P^{\sigma\perp} H^\sigma P^\sigma, \tag{7.11}$$

with $P^{\sigma\perp} = 1 - P^\sigma$ and $H^{\sigma\perp} = P^{\sigma\perp} H^\sigma P^{\sigma\perp}$. As before (see (3.3)) we have

$$\lambda \text{ eigenvalue of } H^\sigma \iff \lambda \text{ eigenvalue of } F_{\Pi^\sigma}(\lambda) \tag{7.12}$$

and to prove Theorem 1.2 we have to estimate the different terms on the r.h.s. of (7.10).

We conclude this section with some general results used above and below.

Lemma 7.1. *P^σ commutes with T_π, for any $\pi \in S_N$, and therefore with Q^σ.*

Proof. To show that T_π commutes with P^σ, it suffices to show that if $\Psi \in \operatorname{Ran} P^\sigma$, then $T_\pi \Psi \in \operatorname{Ran} P^\sigma$. To show the latter it suffices to take Ψ satisfying

$$H_a \Psi = E^\sigma(\infty)\Psi.$$

Therefore, $(T_\pi H_a T_{\pi^{-1}}) T_\pi \Psi = E^\sigma(\infty) T_\pi \Psi$. In addition we have that

$$T_\pi H_a T_{\pi^{-1}} = H_{\pi a},$$

where the clusters of $b = \pi a$ were defined in (2.2). The last two relations imply that

$$H_{\pi a} T_\pi \Psi = E^\sigma(\infty) T_\pi \Psi.$$

As a consequence, $T_\pi \Psi \in \operatorname{Ran} P^\sigma$. □

Lemma 7.2. *For each $\alpha \prec\!\prec \sigma$, any normalized $\Phi \in \operatorname{Ran} P_a^\alpha$ and for R is large enough, we have the estimate*

$$\|Q^\sigma \Phi\|^2 \doteq \frac{\chi_{id}^\sigma}{N!}\frac{\#S(a)}{\chi_{id}^\alpha}, \tag{7.13}$$

and therefore $\operatorname{Ran} P^\sigma \cap \operatorname{Ran} Q^\sigma \neq \{0\}$.

Proof. Using that, due to the exponential decay of the ground states of the atoms, Φ and $T_\pi \Phi$, for $\pi \in S_N/S(a)$, are almost orthogonal i.e. $\langle \Phi, T_\pi \Phi\rangle \doteq 0, \forall \pi \in S_N/S(a)$, and using the expression for Q^σ, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|Q^\sigma \Phi\|^2 = \langle \Phi, Q^\sigma \Phi\rangle &= \frac{\chi_{id}^\sigma}{N!}\sum_{\pi \in S_N} \chi_{\pi^{-1}}^\sigma \langle \Phi, T_\pi \Phi\rangle \\ &\doteq \frac{\chi_{id}^\sigma}{N!}\sum_{\pi \in S(a)} \chi_{\pi^{-1}}^\sigma \langle \Phi, T_\pi \Phi\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

Since $T^\sigma_{S_N}|_{S(a)} = \oplus_{\alpha\prec\sigma} T^\alpha_{S(a)}$, taking the trace of $T^\sigma_{\pi^{-1}} = \oplus_{\alpha\prec\sigma} T^\alpha_{\pi^{-1}}$, $\forall\pi \in S(a)$, we obtain

$$\chi^\sigma_{\pi^{-1}} = \sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} \chi^\beta_{\pi^{-1}}, \qquad \forall\pi \in S(a). \tag{7.15}$$

This, together with the expression (7.5) for the projection $Q^\beta_{S(a)}$ and the relation (7.14) gives that

$$\|Q^\sigma\Phi\|^2 \doteq \frac{\chi^\sigma_{id}}{N!}\langle\Phi, \sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} \frac{\#S(a)}{\chi^\beta_{id}} Q^\beta\Phi\rangle.$$

The last relation together with the fact that $Q^\beta\Phi^{\alpha,j}_a = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}\Phi^{\alpha,j}_a$ gives (7.13). ☐

For given $a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ and $\alpha \prec\prec \sigma$, let

$$\{\Phi^{\alpha,j}_a, j = 1, ..., \deg(\alpha)\}, \tag{7.16}$$

be an orthonormal basis of $\operatorname{Ran} P^\alpha_a$, where recall that P^α_a is the orthogonal projection onto the ground state eigenspace of H^α_a. Maybe we should mention it here. Here $\deg(a)$ is the degree or dimension of the representation α (recall that from Condition (D) the ground state eigenspace P^α_a of H^α_a consists only of one copy of the irreducible representation of type α). By the last lemma we use $T_\pi\Phi^{\alpha,j}_a = \Phi^{\alpha,j}_{\pi a}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Each basis functions $\Phi^{\alpha,i}_a$ are products of ground states of atoms:*

$$\Phi^{\alpha,i}_a = \Phi^{\alpha,i_1}_{A_1} ... \Phi^{\alpha,i_M}_{A_M}, \tag{7.17}$$

where i are identified with $(i_1, \dots, i_M)$.

Proof. We have that $S(a) = \otimes^M_{j=1} S(A_j)$, where A_j are the clusters of the decomposition a, and $S(A_j)$ is the permutation group of the set A_j. Since $\alpha \prec \sigma$, α is of the form $\alpha = \otimes^M_{j=1}\alpha_j$ where α_j is an irreducible representation of $S(A_j)$. To show (7.17) it suffices to show that

$$P^\alpha_a = \prod_{j=1}^M P^{\alpha_j}_{A_j}, \tag{7.18}$$

where recall that P^β_b denotes the projection onto the multiple of irreducible representations of type β. We have that $S(a) \ni \pi = \pi_1 ... \pi_M$, with $\pi_i \in S(A_i)$, and

$$\#S(a) = \prod_{j=1}^M \#S(A_j) \ \text{ and } \ T_\pi = T_{\pi_1} ... T_{\pi_M}.$$

The last relation and the definition of characters imply that

$$\chi^\alpha_{\pi^{-1}} = \prod_{j=1}^M \chi^{\alpha_j}_{\pi_j^{-1}}. \tag{7.19}$$

The last two relations, the formula (7.5) and the relation $\chi^{\alpha_j}_{\pi_j^{-1}} = \chi^\alpha_{\pi_j^{-1}}$ give (7.18). ☐

Lemma 7.4. *The one-electron density,*

$$\rho_1(z_1) := \sum_{i=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \int |\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}(z_1, ..., z_N)|^2 dz_2...dz_N, \tag{7.20}$$

written in terms of the variables z defined in (3.19)*, is spherically symmetric.*

Proof. For any rotation R we define the action

$$T_R\Phi(z_1, ..., z_N) = \Phi(R^{-1}z_1, ..., R^{-1}z_N).$$

Then a simple change of variables together with (7.20) gives that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \int |T_R\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}(z_1, ..., z_N)|^2 dz_2...dz_N = \rho_1(R^{-1}z_1). \tag{7.21}$$

Also since the Hamiltonian H_a^α commutes with T_R we have that $T_R\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}$ is also a ground state of H_a^α and therefore by Condition (D),

$$T_R\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}(z_1, ..., z_N) = \sum_{k=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} d_{ik}\Phi_a^{\alpha,k}(z_1, ..., z_N), \tag{7.22}$$

where (d_{ik}) is a unitary matrix. Therefore, by (7.21) and (7.22) we have that

$$\rho_1(R^{-1}z_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \int |\sum_{k=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} d_{ik}\Phi_a^{\alpha,k}(z_1, ..., z_N)|^2 dz_2...dz_N. \tag{7.23}$$

Expanding the right hand side of the last equation and using that the matrix d_{ij} is unitary and therefore satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \overline{d_{ik_1}} d_{ik_2} = \delta_{k_1k_2}$, we obtain that

$$\rho_1(R^{-1}z_1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \int |\Phi_a^{\alpha,k}(z_1, ..., z_N)|^2 dz_2...dz_N. \tag{7.24}$$

The relations (7.20) and (7.24) imply the spherical symmetry of $\rho_1(z_1)$. □

7.2 Estimate of $P^\sigma H^\sigma P^\sigma$

Lemma 7.5.

$$P^\sigma H^\sigma P^\sigma \doteq E^\sigma(\infty)P^\sigma Q^\sigma. \tag{7.25}$$

Proof. In this proof we omit the superindex σ in $P^\sigma, E^\sigma(\infty), Q^\sigma$ and write instead $P, E(\infty), Q$. Recall that P_a^α is the orthogonal projection onto the ground state eigenspace of H_a^α. Using the orthonormal basis (7.16) in $\operatorname{Ran} P_a^\alpha$, we write

$$P_a^\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} |\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle\langle\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}|. \tag{7.26}$$

Due to the exponential decay of ground states of atoms together with the fact that $\operatorname{Ran} P_a^\alpha, \operatorname{Ran} P_a^\beta$ are orthogonal whenever $\alpha \neq \beta$, $\forall \alpha, \beta \prec \sigma$, and the fact that $\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, j = 1, ..., \deg(\alpha)$, is orthonormal we have that

$$\langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, \Phi_b^{\beta,j} \rangle \doteq \delta_{ab}\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{ij}, \ \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \alpha, \beta \prec\prec \sigma, i = 1, \dots, \deg(\alpha), j = 1, \dots, \deg(\beta). \quad (7.27)$$

Using the last relation together with (7.26), and the fact that P is by definition the orthogonal projection onto $\operatorname{span}\{\operatorname{Ran} P_a^\alpha | a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \alpha \prec\prec \sigma\}$, we obtain that

$$P \doteq \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \beta \prec\prec \sigma} P_b^\beta = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \beta \prec\prec \sigma} \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(\beta)} |\Phi_b^{\beta,j}\rangle\langle\Phi_b^{\beta,j}|. \quad (7.28)$$

Using (7.27), (7.28) and the relations $H = H_b + I_b$ and $H_b \Phi_b^{\beta,j} = E(\infty)\Phi_b^{\beta,j}$, $\forall b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \beta \prec\prec \sigma$, we obtain that

$$PH^\sigma P \doteq E(\infty)PQ + VQ, \quad (7.29)$$

where

$$V := \sum_{a,b,\alpha,\beta,i,j} |\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}\rangle\langle\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_b \Phi_b^{\beta,j}\rangle\langle\Phi_b^{\beta,j}|. \quad (7.30)$$

We will now show that

$$V \doteq 0. \quad (7.31)$$

If $a \neq b$, then $\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, \Phi_b^{\beta,j}$ have exponentially small overlapping tails and therefore

$$\langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_b \Phi_b^{\beta,j} \rangle \doteq 0, \ \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \ a \neq b. \quad (7.32)$$

Let $a = b$ but $\alpha \neq \beta$. Since I_a commutes with T_π for all permutations in $\pi \in S(a)$ and therefore, due to (7.5), with Q_a^β, we have that $I_a \Phi_a^{\beta,j} \in \operatorname{Ran} Q_a^\beta$. Since also $\Phi_a^{\alpha,i} \in \operatorname{Ran} Q_a^\alpha$, we obtain that

$$\langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_a \Phi_a^{\beta,j} \rangle = 0, \ \forall \alpha, \beta \prec\prec \sigma \text{ with } \alpha \neq \beta. \quad (7.33)$$

Assume that $a = b$, $\alpha = \beta$. Let c^π be the matrix of T_π, $\pi \in S(a)$, w.r.t the to the basis (7.16) of $\operatorname{Ran} P_a^\alpha$. Then, since T_π is unitary and commutes with I_a and due to $T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} c_{ik}^\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,k}$ and similarly, $T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} = \sum_{l=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} c_{jl}^\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,l}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} \rangle &= \langle T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_a T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \sum_{l=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \overline{c_{ik}^\pi} c_{jl}^\pi \langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,k}, I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,l} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

So if we define the matrix h with $h_{ji} = \langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_a \Phi_a^{\beta,j} \rangle$, then the last equality becomes

$$h_{ji} = \sum_{s=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \sum_{t=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} c_{jl}^\pi h_{lk} \overline{c_{ik}^\pi},$$

or $h = c^\pi h c^{\pi *}$. Since $c^{\pi *} c^\pi = 1$, we obtain that $hc^\pi = c^\pi h$, $\forall \pi \in S(a)$. Since the representation α is irreducible we have, by a standard result of representation theory, that h is a multiple of the identity. (Indeed, let u be an eigenfunction of h with eigenvalue λ. Then $hc^{\pi}u = c^{\pi}hu = \lambda c^{\pi}u$. So the eigenspace of the eigenvalue λ is invariant under the representation and since the representation is irreducible the eigenspace has to be the entire space. So h is a multiple of the identity.) This shows that

$$\langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} \rangle = \delta_{ij} \langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,1}, I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,1} \rangle. \tag{7.34}$$

Now, using Lemma 7.4 and proceeding as in the proof of (3.16) for $a = b$ we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} \rangle \doteq 0, \tag{7.35}$$

which by (7.34) implies

$$\langle \Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,i} \rangle \doteq 0, \ \forall \alpha \prec\prec \sigma, \ i = 1, ..., \deg(\alpha). \tag{7.36}$$

The relations (7.30), (7.32), (7.33), (7.34) and (7.36), imply (7.31). From (7.29) and (7.31) we obtain (7.25). $\square$

7.3 Lower bound on $H^{\sigma\perp}$

Let $E^{\sigma}(\infty)'$ denote the first excited state energy of the system of non interacting atoms and let

$$\gamma_1^{\sigma} = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}^{at}, \alpha \prec \sigma} (\inf \sigma(H_a^{\alpha}) - E^{\sigma}(\infty)), \quad \gamma_2^{\sigma} = E^{\sigma}(\infty)' - E^{\sigma}(\infty). \tag{7.37}$$

By Property (E) we have that $\gamma_1^{\sigma} > 0$ and, by the definition, we also have that $\gamma_2^{\sigma} > 0$. We also define

$$\gamma_0^{\sigma} = \min\{\gamma_1^{\sigma}, \gamma_2^{\sigma}\}. \tag{7.38}$$

Lemma 7.6. *For R sufficiently large, there exists $\gamma^{\sigma} > 0$ such that*

$$H^{\sigma\perp} \geq (E^{\sigma}(\infty) + 2\gamma^{\sigma}) Q^{\sigma}. \tag{7.39}$$

Proof. In this proof we will also omit for simplicity the superindex σ in $P^{\sigma}, Q^{\sigma}, E^{\sigma}(\infty), \gamma_j^{\sigma}$ and write, instead, $P, Q, E(\infty), \gamma_j$. Using that $H^{\perp} = P^{\perp} H^{\sigma} P^{\perp}$ and that Q commutes with $P^{\perp}$ and the relation (4.9) and $P^{\perp} \leq 1$, we obtain

$$P^{\perp} H^{\sigma} P^{\perp} \geq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q P^{\perp} J_a H_a J_a P^{\perp} Q - \frac{C}{R} Q. \tag{7.40}$$

We will now show that

$$Q P^{\perp} J_a H_a J_a P^{\perp} Q \geq (E(\infty) + \gamma_0) Q P^{\perp} J_a^2 P^{\perp} Q - \frac{C}{R} Q, \ \forall a \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{7.41}$$

Case 1: $a \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}^{at}$**.** By (7.37) and (7.38) we have that

$$H_a^{\beta} = P_a^{\beta} H_a \geq (E(\infty) + \gamma_0) P_a^{\beta}. \tag{7.42}$$

Using this, the relation $Q = Q\sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} Q_a^\beta$ and the fact that Q_a^β commutes with J_a and $Q^\perp$, we obtain that

$$QP^\perp J_a H_a J_a P^\perp Q \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_0)QP^\perp J_a \sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} P_a^\beta J_a P^\perp Q$$

$$= (E(\infty)+\gamma_0)QP^\perp J_a^2 P^\perp Q,$$

which gives (7.41) for $a \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}^{at}$.

Case 2: $a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$**.** Recall that P_a^α is the projection onto the ground state eigenspace of H_a^α and define

$$P_a := \oplus_{\alpha\prec\prec\sigma} P_a^\alpha. \tag{7.43}$$

If $b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ with $b \neq a$, then, repeating the arguments of the proof of (4.15), we obtain

$$\|\Phi_b^{\beta,j} J_a H_a\|,\ \|H_a J_a \Phi_b^{\beta,j}\| \doteq 0,\ \forall j = 1,...,\deg(\beta). \tag{7.44}$$

Relations (7.26), (7.43) and (7.44) imply that

$$H_a J_a P_b \doteq 0, P_b J_a H_a \doteq 0,\ \forall b \in \mathcal{A}^{at} \text{ with } b \neq a, \tag{7.45}$$

and therefore, since $P \doteq \sum_{b\in\mathcal{A}^{at}} P_b$, and $P^\perp = 1-P, P_a^\perp = 1-P_a$, we obtain

$$QP^\perp J_a H_a J_a P^\perp Q \doteq QP_a^\perp J_a H_a J_a P_a^\perp Q. \tag{7.46}$$

In the same way as (4.22), we show that

$$\|[|\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle\langle\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}|, J_a]H_a\| \lesssim \frac{1}{R},\ \forall\alpha \prec\prec \sigma,\ \forall j = 1,...,\deg(\alpha) \tag{7.47}$$

and

$$\|H_a[J_a, |\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle\langle\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}|]\| \lesssim \frac{1}{R},\ \forall\alpha \prec\prec \sigma,\ \forall j = 1,...,\deg(\alpha). \tag{7.48}$$

By (7.26) and (7.43) we have

$$P_a = \sum_{\alpha\prec\prec\sigma} \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(a)} |\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle\langle\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}|,$$

which, together with $P_a^\perp = 1 - P_a$, (7.47) and (7.48) gives

$$P_a^\perp J_a H_a = J_a P_a^\perp H_a + O(\frac{1}{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad H_a J_a P_a^\perp = H_a P_a^\perp J_a + O(\frac{1}{R}). \tag{7.49}$$

From (7.49) and the fact that $Q = Q\sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} Q_a^\beta$ and Q_a^β commutes with $P_a^\perp$ and J_a for all $\beta \prec \sigma$, we derive

$$QP_a^\perp J_a H_a J_a P_a^\perp Q \geq QJ_a P_a^\perp \sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} H_a^\beta P_a^\perp J_a Q - \frac{C}{R}Q. \tag{7.50}$$

If $\beta \prec \sigma$ but $\beta \not\prec\prec \sigma$, then by (7.37) we have that

$$H_a^\beta \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_2)Q_a^\beta, \quad \beta \prec \sigma,\ \beta \not\prec\prec \sigma. \tag{7.51}$$

If now $\beta \prec\!\prec \sigma$, then by (7.43) and $P_a^\perp = 1 - P_a$ we obtain that $P_a^\perp Q_a^\beta$ projects out the ground state eigenspace $\operatorname{Ran} P_a^\beta$ of H_a^β and therefore by (7.37),

$$P_a^\perp H_a^\beta P_a^\perp \geq (E(\infty) + \gamma_2) P_a^\perp Q_a^\beta P_a^\perp, \quad \beta \prec\!\prec \sigma. \tag{7.52}$$

From relations (7.38), (7.51) and (7.52) we obtain that

$$P_a^\perp H_a^\beta P_a^\perp \geq (E(\infty) + \gamma_0) P_a^\perp Q_a^\beta P_a^\perp, \quad \forall \beta \prec \sigma. \tag{7.53}$$

Repeating the arguments of the proof of (7.49) we can obtain that

$$\|[J_a, P_a^\perp]\| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}.$$

In addition, we have that

$$J_a P_a^\perp J_a = P_a^\perp J_a^2 P_a^\perp + [J_a, P_a^\perp] P_a^\perp J_a - P_a^\perp J_a [J_a, P_a^\perp].$$

The last two relations give us that

$$J_a P_a^\perp J_a \leq P_a^\perp J_a^2 P_a^\perp + \frac{C}{R}.$$

Using the last relation and the fact that

$$P_a^\perp J_a \doteq P^\perp J_a, J_a P_a^\perp \doteq J_a P^\perp, \ \forall a \in \mathcal{A}^{at},$$

which can be proven similarly to (7.45), we obtain

$$J_a P_a^\perp J_a \leq P^\perp J_a^2 P^\perp + \frac{C}{R}. \tag{7.54}$$

Similarly to (4.28), we can show

$$E(\infty) + \gamma_0 < 0. \tag{7.55}$$

The relation (7.41) for $a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ follows immediately from the relations (7.46), (7.50), (7.53), (7.54) and (7.55), together with the relations $Q = Q \sum_{\beta \prec \sigma} Q_a^\beta$ and $H_a^\beta = Q_a^\beta H_a$ and the fact that Q_a^β commutes with $P_a^\perp$ and J_a, for all $\beta \prec \sigma$. This completes the proof of (7.41). The relations (4.7), (7.40), (7.41) together with (7.55) and $Q^\perp \leq 1$ give that $H^\perp \geq (E(\infty) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_0) Q$, provided R is sufficiently large, as desired. □

7.4 Rough bound on $E^\sigma(y)$

Lemma 7.7. *For R sufficiently large,*

$$E^\sigma(y) \leq E^\sigma(\infty) + O(e^{-CR}). \tag{7.56}$$

Proof. We fix an $\alpha \prec\prec \sigma$ and let $\Phi_a^\alpha := \Phi_a^{\alpha,1}$. Since Q^σ is self-adjoint and, by (7.4), commutes with H and since, by Lemma 7.2, $\|Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha\| > 0$, we have that

$$E^\sigma(y) \le \frac{\langle Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha, H \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle}{\|Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha\|^2}.$$

Therefore, using the last relation, that $H = H_a + I_a$ and that $H_a \Phi_a^\alpha = E^\sigma(\infty)\Phi_a^\alpha$, we obtain that

$$E^\sigma(y) \le E^\sigma(\infty) + \frac{\langle Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle}{\|Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha\|^2}.$$

It is therefore enough to show that

$$\frac{\langle Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle}{\|Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha\|^2} \lesssim e^{-CR}. \tag{7.57}$$

Due to exponential decay of ground states we have that

$$\langle T_\pi \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle \doteq 0, \quad \forall \pi \in S_N/S(a).$$

With this observation, we can repeat the arguments of the proof of (7.13) to obtain

$$\langle Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle \doteq \frac{\chi_{id}^\sigma}{N!} \frac{\#S(a)}{\chi_{id}^\alpha} \langle \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle.$$

The last relation together with (7.13) gives that $\frac{\langle Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle}{\|Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha\|^2} \doteq \langle \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle$ and therefore by (7.36) we obtain that

$$\frac{\langle Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha, I_a \Phi_a^\alpha \rangle}{\|Q^\sigma \Phi_a^\alpha\|^2} \doteq 0.$$

The last relation gives (7.57) immediately. □

7.5 Estimate of $U^\sigma := U^\sigma(E^\sigma)$

We show in Appendix A that the term $U^\sigma(E^\sigma)$, defined in (7.11), satisfies the estimates

$$U^\sigma = \sum_{\alpha \prec\prec \sigma} P^\alpha \Big(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}}{|y_i - y_j|^6} + O\Big(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7} \Big) \Big), \tag{7.58}$$

where

$$P^\alpha := Q^\sigma \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}} P_a^\alpha Q^\sigma \tag{7.59}$$

and $\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}$ are given in (A.4).

7.6 Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.2

Since $\Pi^\sigma = Q^\sigma P Q^\sigma$ by (7.28) and (7.59) we obtain that

$$\Pi^\sigma \doteq \sum_{\alpha \prec\prec \sigma} P^\alpha. \tag{7.60}$$

Therefore, from relations (7.10), (7.25), (7.58) and (7.60) we obtain that

$$F_{\Pi^\sigma}(E^\sigma) = \sum_{\alpha \prec\prec \sigma} P^\alpha \left(E^\sigma(\infty) - \sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}}{|y_i - y_j|^6} + O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}) \right). \tag{7.61}$$

Moreover, using an argument similar to the one of the proof of the relation (3.36) we obtain that E^σ is the lowest eigenvalue of $F_{\Pi^\sigma}(E^\sigma)$. By (7.59) and by the fact that $P_a^\alpha P_b^\beta \doteq 0, \forall \alpha \neq \beta$ and that P_a^α commutes with Q^σ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}^{at}, \alpha \prec\prec \sigma$ we obtain that $P^\alpha P^\beta \doteq 0$ for all $\alpha \neq \beta$ which together with (7.61) and the fact that E^σ is the lowest eigenvalue of $F_{\Pi^\sigma}(E^\sigma)$ gives that

$$E^\sigma = E^\sigma(\infty) + \min_{\alpha \prec\prec \sigma} \{ - \sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}}{|y_i - y_j|^6} + O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}) \},$$

as desired.

A Estimate of $U^\sigma := U^\sigma(E^\sigma)$

Recall that $\phi_{A_m}^{\alpha,k}, j = 1, ..., n_m$, form an orthonormal basis of the ground state energy space of the $m-$th atom with the ground state energy E_m^σ,

$$H_{A_m} \phi_{A_m}^{\alpha, j_m} = E_m^\sigma \phi_{A_m}^{\alpha, j_m}. \tag{A.1}$$

and that as in (2.7), $\phi_{A_j}^{\alpha,i}(x_{A_j}) = \phi_j^{\alpha,i}(x_{A_j} - y_j)$, with $x_{A_j} = (x_i : i \in A_j)$, $x_{A_k} - y_j = (x_i - y_j : i \in A_j)$ and $\phi_j^{\alpha,i}$ a ground state of the j-th atom with the nucleus fixed at the origin and of a symmetry type α. Let $P_{ij}^\perp := \mathbf{1} - P_{ij}$ and $P_{ij} = P_i \otimes P_j$, with

$$P_k := \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} |\phi_{A_k}^{\alpha,j}\rangle\langle\phi_{A_k}^{\alpha,j}| \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$R_{kl}^\perp := (P_{kl}^\perp (H_{A_k} + H_{A_l}) P_{kl}^\perp - E_k^\sigma - E_l^\sigma)^{-1}. \tag{A.3}$$

Our goal is to prove the following lemma:

Lemma A.1. *The equation* (7.58) *holds with*

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha} := \frac{e^4}{\deg(\alpha)} \sum_{l=1}^{n_i} \sum_{m=1}^{n_j} \langle f_{ij} \phi_{A_i}^l \phi_{A_j}^m, (P_{ij}^\perp (H_{A_i} + H_{A_j}) P_{ij}^\perp - E_i^\sigma - E_j^\sigma)^{-1} f_{ij} \phi_{A_i}^l \phi_{A_j}^m \rangle. \tag{A.4}$$

Proof. In this proof we will also omit for simplicity the superindex σ in $P^\sigma, Q^\sigma, E^\sigma(\infty), E^\sigma(\infty), \gamma^\sigma$ and write, instead, $P, Q, E, E(\infty), \gamma$. Recall that $U^\sigma(\lambda)$ was defined in (7.11). Using that $H^\sigma = HQ$ and the fact that Q commutes with H and P we obtain that

$$U^\sigma = QPHP^\perp(P^\perp H^\sigma P^\perp - E)^{-1}P^\perp HPQ. \tag{A.5}$$

We extend the class of decompositions by considering, in addition, partitions into a molecular ion and the $j-$th electron and define the refined covering

$$\begin{aligned} \bar\Omega_a^\beta &:= \{|x_i - y_k| \leq \beta R, \forall i \in A_k, \forall k = 1, ..., M\},\ \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \\ \Omega_j^\beta &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3N} : |x_j - y_k| \geq \beta R/2, \forall k = 1, ..., M\},\ \forall j = 1, ..., N, \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

and the corresponding partition of unity $\{J_a, J_j\}$ having the properties

$$0 \leq J_a \leq 1, \operatorname{supp} J_a \subset \Omega_a^{\frac{1}{5}}, \|\nabla J_a\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{1}{R}, \|\Delta J_a\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2},\ \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{1, 2, ..., N\}, \tag{A.7}$$

and obeying the relation

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{1,...,N\}} J_a^2 = 1. \tag{A.8}$$

The construction can be proven following [Sig] as we did for the construction of the partition of unity satisfying (4.5) and (4.7). As in Subsection 7.3 we represent the operator $P^\perp H^\sigma P^\perp$ as

$$P^\perp H^\sigma P^\perp = QKQ, \tag{A.9}$$

where

$$K = K_0 + O(\frac{1}{R}), \tag{A.10}$$

with

$$K_0 = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{1,...,N\}} K_b, \tag{A.11}$$

$$K_b := \begin{cases} \sum_{\beta \prec \sigma} J_b P_b^{\beta\perp} H_b^\beta P_b^{\beta\perp} J_b, & \text{for } b \in \mathcal{A}, \\ J_j \sum_{\beta \prec \sigma} H_j^\beta J_j, & \text{for } b = j \in \{1, ..., N\}, \end{cases} \tag{A.12}$$

where $P_b^{\beta\perp} = \mathbf{1}$ if $b \in \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}^{at}$ or $\beta \not\prec\prec \sigma$ and $P_b^{\beta\perp} = \mathbf{1} - P_b^\beta$ if $b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ and $\beta \prec\prec \sigma$, and $H_j := H + \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{e^2 Z_k}{|x_j - y_k|}$. Moreover, for $b = j \in \{1, ..., N\}$, β refers to an irreducible representation of S_{N-1}.

Lemma A.2. *There exists* $\gamma > 0$ *such that*

$$K \geq E + 2\gamma, \quad K_0 \geq E + 2\gamma. \tag{A.13}$$

Proof. Due to (A.12) and the HVZ theorem with symmetries (see [Sig]) we have that there exists $\gamma_1 > 0$ such that

$$K_j \geq (E + \gamma_1)J_j^2, \quad \forall j \in \{1, ..., N\}. \tag{A.14}$$

In addition, by (7.53) and (A.12) we obtain that

$$K_b \geq (E(\infty) + \gamma_0) \sum_{\beta \prec \sigma} J_b P_b^{\beta\perp} Q_b^\beta P_b^{\beta\perp} J_b,\ \forall b \in \mathcal{A}.$$

But since $E(\infty)+\gamma_0<0$ and

$$\sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} P_b^{\beta\perp} Q_b^\beta P_b^{\beta\perp} \leq \sum_{\beta\prec\sigma} Q_b^\beta \leq 1$$

we obtain that

$$K_b \geq (E(\infty)+\gamma_0) J_b^2, \ \forall b\in\mathcal{A}. \tag{A.15}$$

Therefore, by (A.8), (A.10), (A.11), (A.14) and (A.15) we obtain (A.13). □

From (A.5) and (A.9) we obtain that

$$U^\sigma = QPHP^\perp(QKQ-E)^{-1}P^\perp HPQ.$$

Since K is symmetric with respect to particle coordinates, it commutes with all permutations and therefore with Q. Since Q commutes with P, H and K and due to (A.13), we have that

$$U^\sigma = QPHP^\perp(K-E)^{-1}P^\perp HPQ.$$

On the other by the second resolvent formula we have that

$$(K-E)^{-1} = (K_0-E)^{-1} - (K-E)^{-1}(K-K_0)(K_0-E)^{-1}.$$

The last two relations together with (A.10) imply that

$$U^\sigma = QPHP^\perp(K_0-E)^{-1}P^\perp HPQ + \mathrm{Rem},$$

where

$$\mathrm{Rem} = QPHP^\perp O(\frac{1}{R})P^\perp HPQ.$$

Therefore, using the last relation and

$$P \doteq \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}^{at},\alpha\prec\prec\sigma,j=1,\dots,\deg(\alpha)} |\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle\langle\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}|,$$

we obtain that

$$U^\sigma \doteq \sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{A}^{at},\alpha,\beta\prec\prec\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(\beta)} Q^\sigma|\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}\rangle V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij}\langle\Phi_b^{\beta,j}|Q^\sigma + \mathrm{Rem}, \tag{A.16}$$

where

$$V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij} = \langle H\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, P^\perp(K_0-E)^{-1}P^\perp H\Phi_b^{\beta,j}\rangle. \tag{A.17}$$

Using now that $H=H_a+I_a$ and that $\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}$ is eigenfunction of H_a we obtain that $\langle\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}|HP = \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}|P$. Similarly we obtain that $P^\perp H\Phi_b^{\beta,j} = P^\perp I_b\Phi_b^{\beta,j}$. This gives that

$$V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij} = \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, P^\perp(K_0-E)^{-1}P^\perp I_b\Phi_b^{\beta,j}\rangle. \tag{A.18}$$

Repeating the arguments of the proof of (3.47), we show that

$$V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij} \doteq \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, (K_0-E)^{-1} I_b\Phi_b^{\beta,j}\rangle. \tag{A.19}$$

Similarly we can obtain that

$$\mathrm{Rem} \doteq \sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{A}^{at},\alpha,\beta\prec\prec\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(\beta)} \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, O(\frac{1}{R}) I_b \Phi_b^{\beta,j}\rangle.$$

Proceeding as in the proof of (3.30) we can obtain that

$$\|I_c\Phi_c^{\gamma,k}\| \leq O(\sum_{i<j}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^3}), \forall c\in\mathcal{A}^{at}, \gamma\prec\prec\sigma, k=1,...,\deg(\gamma). \tag{A.20}$$

The last two relations give that

$$\mathrm{Rem} = O(\sum_{i<j}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^7}). \tag{A.21}$$

The relations (A.16) and (A.21) together with Lemma A.3 below and (7.26), gives (7.58)-(7.59). □

Lemma A.3. *The following equations hold:*

$$V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij} = O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^7}), \qquad \forall a\neq b. \tag{A.22}$$

$$V_{aa}^{\alpha\beta ij} = 0, \qquad \forall a\in\mathcal{A}^{at}, \forall\alpha,\beta\prec\prec\sigma, \alpha\neq\beta. \tag{A.23}$$

$$V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha ij} = V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha 11}\delta_{ij}. \tag{A.24}$$

$$V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha 11} = V_{bb}^{\alpha\alpha 11}, \qquad \forall a,b\in\mathcal{A}^{at}. \tag{A.25}$$

Moreover, we have that

$$V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha 11} = \sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{e^4\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}}{|y_i-y_j|^6} + O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^7}), \tag{A.26}$$

where the positive constants $\sigma_{ij}^{\sigma,\alpha}$ are given by (A.4).

Proof. In this proof we keep writing E and $E(\infty)$ for E^σ and $E^\sigma(\infty)$. For each $c\in\mathcal{A}^{at}$ we consider a C^∞ function χ_c that commutes with all permutations in $S(c)$ such that

$$\chi_c(x) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } x\in\bar\Omega_c^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ 0 \text{ if } x\in(\bar\Omega_c^{\frac{1}{2}})^c, \end{cases} \tag{A.27}$$

where $\bar\Omega_c^{\frac{1}{3}}$ was defined in (A), and

$$\|\partial^\alpha\chi_c\| \lesssim R^{-|\alpha|}, \text{ for any multi-index } \alpha. \tag{A.28}$$

Then due to the exponential decay of $\Phi_c^{\gamma,j}$ we have that

$$I_c\Phi_c^{\gamma,j} \doteq \chi_c I_c\Phi_c^{\gamma,j}, \Phi_c^{\gamma,j} \doteq \chi_c\Phi_c^{\gamma,j}. \tag{A.29}$$

The last relation and (A.19) imply that

$$V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij} \doteq \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, \chi_a(K_0-E)^{-1}\chi_b I_b\Phi_b^{\beta,j}\rangle. \tag{A.30}$$

Since $\chi_a\chi_b = 0$ and

$$[\chi_a,(K_0-E)^{-1}] = (K_0-E)^{-1}[K_0,\chi_a](K_0-E)^{-1},$$

we obtain that

$$\chi_a(K_0-E)^{-1}\chi_b = (K_0-E)^{-1}[K_0,\chi_a](K_0-E)^{-1}\chi_b.$$

Furthermore, since $\chi_a J_c = 0, \forall c \neq a$ the relations (A.11) and (A.12) give that

$$[K_0,\chi_a] = [K_a,\chi_a].$$

The last two relations give that

$$\chi_a(K_0-E)^{-1}\chi_b = (K_0-E)^{-1}[K_a,\chi_a](K_0-E)^{-1}. \tag{A.31}$$

Also by (A.11) we obtain that K_0 is symmetric with respect to the particle coordinates and therefore

$$T_\pi K_0 = K_0 T_\pi, \forall \pi \in S_N. \tag{A.32}$$

Hence, due to (7.5), K_0 commutes with Q_a^α. Since $Q_a^\alpha I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,i} = I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}$ and Q_a^α commutes with K_a, J_a and K_0, the equation (A.31) together with (A.12), (A.30) and $Q_a^\alpha Q_a^\beta = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}Q_a^\alpha$, gives that

$$V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij} \doteq \langle \Psi_a, [J_a H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} J_a, \chi_a]\Psi_b\rangle, \tag{A.33}$$

where

$$\Psi_a = (K_0-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,i}, \Psi_b = (K_0-E)^{-1}I_b\Phi_b^{\beta,j}. \tag{A.34}$$

Since $H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} = H_a^\alpha - E_a^\alpha P_a^\alpha$ (where E_a^α is the eigenvalue corresponding to the eigenspace P_a^α of H_a^α) and χ_a commutes with J_a we obtain that

$$[J_a H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} J_a, \chi_a] = J_a([H_a^\alpha,\chi_a] - E_a^\alpha[P_a^\alpha,\chi_a])J_a.$$

Due to (7.26) and (A.29) we obtain that $[P_a^\alpha,\chi_a] \doteq 0$ and therefore

$$[J_a H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} J_a, \chi_a] \doteq J_a[H_a^\alpha,\chi_a]J_a.$$

Using now that $H_a^\alpha = H_a Q_a^\alpha$ and that Q_a^α commutes with χ_a and using that $[H_a,\chi_a] = [-\Delta,\chi_a] = -\Delta\chi_a - (\nabla\chi_a)\cdot\nabla$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}[J_a H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} J_a, \chi_a] &\doteq J_a(Q_a^\alpha[H_a,\chi_a]Q_a^\alpha)J_a \\ &= -J_a Q_a^\alpha(\Delta\chi_a + (\nabla\chi_a)\cdot\nabla)Q_a^\alpha J_a.\end{aligned} \tag{A.35}$$

Using the last relation, together with (A.13), (A.20), (A.28), (A.33) and (A.34), we obtain that

$$V_{ab}^{\alpha\beta ij} = -\langle \Psi_a, J_a Q_a^\alpha((\nabla\chi_a)\cdot\nabla)Q_a^\alpha)J_a\Psi_b\rangle + O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^7}).$$

To estimate the first term on the r.h.s., we note that there exists a positive constant c such that

$$X_1 := \|\nabla Q_a^\alpha J_a \Psi_a\| \lesssim \|\sqrt{H_a + c} Q_a^\alpha J_a \Psi_a\| = \langle \Psi_a, J_a Q_a^\alpha (H_a^\alpha + c) Q_a^\alpha J_a \Psi_a \rangle^{1/2}.$$

Since $H_a^\alpha = H_a^\alpha P_a^\alpha + H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp}$ and $H_a^\alpha P_a^\alpha$ is bounded operator, by (A.20), this gives

$$X_1^2 \lesssim O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^6}) + \langle \Psi_a, J_a (H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} + c) J_a \Psi_a \rangle.$$

Since by (A.11) and (A.12) $J_a H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} J_a$ is summand of K_0 and each of the summand of K_0 in (A.11) is bounded from below we obtain that there exists a constant $d > 0$ such that

$$J_a (H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} + c) J_a < K_0 + d.$$

The last two relations give that

$$X_1^2 \lesssim O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^6}) + \langle \Psi_a, (K_0 + d) \Psi_a \rangle.$$

The last inequality together with (A.20) and (A.34) gives

$$X_1 := \|\nabla Q_a^\alpha J_a \Psi_a\| \lesssim O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^3}). \tag{A.36}$$

Therefore, (A.22) holds true. Using (A.17), that $Q_a^\alpha \Phi_a^{\gamma,m} = \delta_{\alpha\gamma} \Phi_a^{\gamma,m}$, and that Q_a^α is self-adjoint and commutes with I_a, Q, H, K_0 (with the last because of (A.32)), we obtain (A.23). Using (A.17) and repeating the arguments of the proof of (7.34) we prove (A.24).

We will now prove (A.25). Since $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^{at}$ there exists a permutation π such that $b = \pi a$ where the action of π was defined in (2.2). Hence we may assume without loss of generality that $T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} = \Phi_{\pi a}^{\alpha,j}$. Since on the other hand T_π is unitary and commutes with Q^σ, P, H, K_0 and $T_\pi I_a = I_b T_\pi$ we obtain using (A.18) that

$$V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha jj} = \langle I_b T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, P^\perp (K_0 - E^\sigma)^{-1} P^\perp I_b T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} \rangle.$$

But since $b = \pi a$ and $T_\pi \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} = \Phi_{\pi a}^{\alpha,j}$, (A.25) follows.

We will now prove (A.26). We first prove the following relation:

$$Y_1 := V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha jj} - \langle I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a - E)^{-1} I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} \rangle = O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}). \tag{A.37}$$

Using (A.19) and (A.29), we obtain that

$$Y_1 \doteq \langle I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, [(K_0 - E^\sigma)^{-1} \chi_a - \chi_a (K_a - E)^{-1}] I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j} \rangle. \tag{A.38}$$

By (A), (A.7) and (A.27) we obtain that $\chi_a J_b = 0$ for all $a \neq b$ which together with (A.11) and (A.12) gives that

$$\chi_a K_0 = \chi_a K_a.$$

The last relation together with (A.38) and the second resolvent equation gives that

$$Y_1 \doteq \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_0-E)^{-1}[\chi_a, K_a](K_a-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle.$$

Since $Q_a^\alpha I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j} = I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}$ and Q_a^α commutes with both K_a, K_0 the last relation together with (A.12) and $Q_a^\alpha Q_a^\beta = 0$, for $\alpha \neq \beta$, gives that

$$Y_1 \doteq \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_0-E)^{-1}[\chi_a, J_aH_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp}J_a](K_a-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle. \tag{A.39}$$

The relations (A.20), (A.28), (A.35) and (A.39) yield that

$$\begin{aligned}Y_1 = \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_0-E)^{-1}J_a(Q_a^\alpha(\nabla\chi_a)\cdot\nabla Q_a^\alpha)J_a(K_a-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle \\ +O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^7}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (A.13), (A.20), (A.28) and the last relation, showing (A.37) reduces to showing that

$$\|\nabla Q_a^\alpha J_a(K_a-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\| \lesssim O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^3}), \tag{A.40}$$

which can be proven similarly to (A.36). This completes the proof of (A.37).

We will now prove that

$$\begin{aligned}Y_2 := \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle - \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle \\ = O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i-y_j|^7}),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$K_a^\alpha = P_a^{\alpha\perp}H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp}. \tag{A.41}$$

Using the second resolvent formula we have that

$$(K_a-E)^{-1} = (K_a^\alpha-E)^{-1} - (K_a^\alpha-E^\sigma)^{-1}(K_a-K_a^\alpha)(K_a-E)^{-1},$$

and the relation $Q_a^\alpha I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j} = I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}$ and using that Q_a^α commutes with K_a^α, we obtain that

$$Y_2 = \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha-E)^{-1}Q_a^\alpha(K_a-K_a^\alpha)(K_a-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle. \tag{A.42}$$

In addition, using (A.12), (A.41) and that $Q_a^\alpha Q_a^\beta = 0$, we obtain that

$$Q_a^\alpha K_a = Q_a^\alpha J_aK_a^\alpha J_a.$$

The last relation together with (A.42) gives that

$$Y_2 = \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha-E^\sigma)^{-1}(J_aK_a^\alpha J_a - K_a^\alpha)(K_a-E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle.$$

Inserting $-K_a^\alpha J_a^2 + K_a^\alpha J_a^2$ we obtain that

$$Y_2 = Y_{21} - Y_{22}, \tag{A.43}$$

with

$$Y_{21} = \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1}[J_a, K_a^\alpha]J_a(K_a - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle \tag{A.44}$$

and

$$Y_{22} = \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1}K_a^\alpha(1 - J_a^2)(K_a - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle. \tag{A.45}$$

We will first show that

$$|Y_{21}| \leq O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}). \tag{A.46}$$

Indeed, by (A.41) and the fact that $K_a^\alpha = H_a^\alpha - E(\infty)P_a^\alpha$ we have that

$$[J_a, K_a^\alpha] = [J_a, H_a] - E(\infty)[J_a, P_a^\alpha].$$

Since also $[J_a, P_a^\alpha] \doteq 0$ (we can obtain that by repeating the arguments of the proof of (7.49)) and $[J_a, H_a] = [J_a, -\Delta]$ we obtain that

$$[J_a, K_a^\alpha] = P_a^\alpha\Delta J_a + P_a^\alpha(\nabla J_a)\cdot\nabla + O(\frac{1}{R}).$$

Using (A.7), (A.20), (A.44) and the last relation, we obtain that showing (A.46) reduces to showing that

$$\langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1}P_a^\alpha((\nabla J_a)\cdot\nabla)J_a(K - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle$$
$$\lesssim \sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}.$$

Using (A.7) and (A.20) we obtain that the last estimate reduces to showing that

$$\|\nabla P_a^\alpha(K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\| \leq O(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^3}). \tag{A.47}$$

Since

$$\|\nabla P_a^\alpha(K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\| \lesssim \|\sqrt{H_a + c}P_a^\alpha(K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\|,$$

we obtain that

$$\|\nabla P_a^\alpha(K_a^\alpha - E^\sigma)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\|^2 \lesssim \langle I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha - E^\sigma)^{-1}(H_a^\alpha + c)(K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle.$$

The last relation together with the fact that $H_a = H_a^\alpha P_a^{\alpha\perp} + H_a^\alpha P_a^\alpha = K_a^\alpha + E_a^\alpha P_a^\alpha \leq K_a^\alpha + E_a^\alpha$ and the relation (A.20) gives (A.47) and this completes the proof of (A.46).

Now, we estimate (A.45). We will now show that Proceeding as in the proof of (3.41) we can show that

$$\|((K_a^\alpha)_\delta - E)^{-1}\| \lesssim 1 \tag{A.48}$$

(in fact showing the last relation is much simpler than (3.41) because P_a^α is eigenspace of H_a^α). Inserting $e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}$ three times we obtain that

$$Y_{22} = \langle e^{\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, ((K_a^\alpha)_\delta - E)^{-1}(K_a^\alpha)_\delta e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(1 - J_a^2)(K - E)^{-1}I_a\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle.$$

It follows from from (3.39), (A), (A.7) ($\operatorname{supp} J_a \subset \Omega_a^{\frac{1}{5}}$) and (A.8) that

$$e^{-\delta\varphi(x-y_a)}(1-J_a^2) \doteq 0.$$

Since, by (A.48), $((K_a^\alpha)_\delta - E)^{-1}(K_a^\alpha)_\delta$ is bounded, this leads to $Y_{22} \doteq 0$. This estimate and relations (A.43) and (A.46), give (A). The relations (A.37) and (A) imply

$$V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha jj} = \langle I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, (K_a^\alpha - E)^{-1} I_a \Phi_a^{\alpha,j}\rangle + O\Big(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}\Big). \tag{A.49}$$

Using (A.49) and proceeding similarly to the proof of (3.53) we obtain that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} V_{aa}^{\alpha\alpha mm} = \sum_{i<j}^{1,M}\sum_{k<l}^{1,M}\sum_{m=1}^{\deg(\alpha)} e^4 W_{ij;kl}^{(m)} + O\Big(\sum_{i<j}^{1,M} \frac{1}{|y_i - y_j|^7}\Big). \tag{A.50}$$

where

$$W_{ij;kl}^{(m)} := \frac{\langle f_{ij}\Phi_a^{\alpha,m}, ((P_a^\alpha)^\perp H_a^\alpha (P_a^\alpha)^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} f_{kl}\Phi_a^{\alpha,m}\rangle}{|y_i - y_j|^3 |y_k - y_l|^3}. \tag{A.51}$$

By (7.17), we have that each $\Phi_a^{\alpha,m}$, $, m = 1, ..., \deg(\alpha)$, is product,

$$\Phi_a^{\alpha,m} = \phi_{A_1}^{\alpha,i_1} \dots \phi_{A_M}^{\alpha,i_M}, \tag{A.52}$$

of ground states, $\phi_{A_k}^{\alpha,i}$, of atoms with the ground state energies E_k^σ (see (A.1)). Using (A.52), we show as in (6.23) that

$$((P_a^\alpha)^\perp H_a^\alpha (P_a^\alpha)^\perp - E(\infty))^{-1} f_{kl}\Phi_a^{\alpha,j} = R_{kl}^\perp f_{kl}\Phi_a^{\alpha,j}, \tag{A.53}$$

where the operators $R_{kl}^\perp$ are given by (A.3). Now, using (A.53), we obtain that

$$W_{ij;kl}^{(m)} = \frac{\langle f_{ij}\Phi_a^{\alpha,m}, R_{kl}^\perp f_{kl}\Phi_a^{\alpha,m}\rangle}{|y_i - y_j|^3 |y_k - y_l|^3}. \tag{A.54}$$

We will show that

$$W_{ij;kl}^{(m)} = 0, \text{ when } ij \neq kl. \tag{A.55}$$

Indeed, assume without loss of generality that $i \neq k, l$. Then by (3.52) f_{ij} is odd in the variables $z_{mi}, m \in A_i$ defined in (3.19). One the other hand the function $\overline{\Phi_a^{\alpha,m}} R_{kl}^\perp f_{kl}\Phi_a^{\alpha,m}$ is even in these variables ($P_{kl}, H_{A_k}, H_{A_l}, f_{kl}$ act on different variables). Hence (A.55) follows. Using that (A.52) implies that $R_{ij}^\perp f_{ij}\Phi_a^{\alpha,m} = \prod_{k\neq i,j} \phi_{A_k}^{\alpha,m_k} R_{ij}^\perp f_{ij} \phi_{A_i}^{\alpha,m_i}\phi_{A_j}^{\alpha,m_j}$, we have, for $ij = kl$,

$$W_{ij;ij}^{(m)} = \frac{\langle f_{ij}\phi_{A_i}^{\alpha,m_i}\phi_{A_j}^{\alpha,m_j}, R_{ij}^\perp f_{ij}\phi_{A_i}^{\alpha,m_i}\phi_{A_j}^{\alpha,m_j}\rangle}{|y_i - y_j|^6}. \tag{A.56}$$

The last relation together with (A.24), (A.50) and (A.55), implies the relation (A.26). □

B Beyond Born-Oppenheimer Approximation

Let $\psi_{\mathrm{BO}}(x,y)$ be the ground state of $H_N(y)$, normalized as $\int |\psi_{\mathrm{BO}}(x,y)|^2 dx = 1$. Using the Feshbach - Schur map with the orthogonal projection

$$(Pf)(x,y) = \psi_{\mathrm{BO}}(x,y) \int \overline{\psi_{\mathrm{BO}}(x,y)} f(x,y) dx$$

(i.e. integrating out the electronic degrees of freedom), as it is done e.g. in [GS], we can show that

$$\lambda \in \sigma_d(H_{\mathrm{mol}}) \;\leftrightarrow\; \lambda \in \sigma_d(H_{\mathrm{nucl}}(\lambda)),$$

with the corresponding eigenfunctions related accordingly. Here $H_{\mathrm{nucl}}(\lambda)$ is the operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3M})$, defined by

$$H_{\mathrm{nucl}}(\lambda) := -\sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{1}{2m_j} \Delta_{y_j} + E_\kappa(y,\lambda),$$

where $\kappa := m/\min_j m_j$ and

$$E_\kappa(y,\lambda) = E(y) + \sum_{1}^{M} \frac{1}{2m_j} \int |\nabla_{y_j} \psi_{BO}|^2 dx + O(\kappa^2),$$

with $O(\kappa^2)$ standing for a non-local operator of the indicated order. The energy $E_\kappa(y)$ (not potential anymore) can be used to define the interaction energy in all orders.

References

[ARV] E.A.G. Armour, J.-M. Richard and K.Varga: Stability of few-charge systems in quantum mechanics. *Physics Reports* **413** 1-90 (2005).

[BFS] V. Bach, J. Fröhlich and I.M. Sigal: Renormalization Group Analysis of Spectral Problems in Quantum field theory. *Adv. in Math.* **137**, 205-298 (1998).

[CDS] J.-M. Combes, P. Duclos and R. Seiler: The Born-Oppenheimer approximation, in: Rigorous Atomic and Molecular Physics (eds. G. Velo, A. Wightman), New York, Plenum, 185-212 (1981).

[CFKS] H.L. Cycon, R.G. Froese , W. Kirsch and B. Simon : Schrödinger Operators with application to quantum mechanics and global geometry. *Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer study edition. Springer-Verlag Berlin* (1987).

[FS] G. Feinberg and J. Sucher: General theory of the van der Waals interaction: a model independent approach. *Phys. Rev. A* **9**, 2395-2415 (1970).

[FS1] C.L. Fefferman and L.A. Seco: Asymptotic neutrality of large ions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **128**, 109-130 (1990).

[FS] C.L. Fefferman and L.A. Seco: The spin of the ground state of an atom. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **12**, No. 1, 19-36 (1996).

[BFGR] J. Fröhlich, G.M. Graf, J.-M. Richard and M. Seifert : Proof of stability of the hydrogen molecule. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **71**, No.9, 30 1332-1334 (1993).

[Fr] J. Fröhlich: Spin - or, actually: Spin and Quantum Statistics. *Prog. Math. Phys.*, **55**, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1-60 (2009).

[GS] S. Gustafson and I.M. Sigal: Mathematical concepts of quantum mechanics. *Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, New York* (2000).

[Hag] G. Hagedorn: High order corrections to the time independent Born-Oppenheimer approximation. I: Smooth potentials. *Annales de l'I. H. P.*, **47**, 1-16 (1987).

[Hag2] G.Hagedorn: High order corrections to the time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation. I. Smooth potentials. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **124** No. 3, 571-590 (1986). Erratum to: High order corrections to the time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation. I. Smooth potentials. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **126** No. 1, 219 (1987).

[Ha] M. Hamermesh: Group theory and its application to physical problems. *Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.* (1962).

[Hi] R. N. Hill: Proof that the H- ion has only one bound state. Details and extension to finite nuclear mass. *J. Math. Phys.* **18**, 2316-2330 (1977).

[Ho] R. Howe: Dual pairs in physics: harmonic oscillators, photons, electrons, and singletons. Applications of group theory in physics and mathematical physics (Chicago, 1982), *Lectures in Appl. Math.*, **21**, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 179207 (1985).

[Hu] W. Hunziker: Distortion analyticity and molecular resonance curves. *Annales de l'I. H. P., section A,* tome **45**, No. 4 , 339-358 (1986).

[HG] W. Hunziker and C. Günther: Bound states in dipole fields and continuity properties of electronic spectra. *Helv. Phys. Acta, t.* **53**, 201-208 (1980).

[HS] W. Hunziker and I.M. Sigal: The quantum $N-$body problem. *J. Math. Phys.* **41** No.6, 3448-3510 (2000).

[KMSW] M. Klein, A. Martinez, R. Seiler and X. P. Wang.: On the Born-Oppenheimer expansion for polyatomic molecules. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **143** No. 3, 607-639 (1992).

[LeL] C. Le Bris and P.-L. Lions: From atoms to crystals: a mathematical journey. *Bulletin AMS* **42**, No. 3, 291 - 363 (2005).

[Lieb] E.H. Lieb: Bound on the maximum negative ionization of atoms and molecules. *Phys. Rev. A* **29**, 3018-3028 (1984).

[LL] E.H. Lieb and M. Loss: Analysis. *Graduate Studies in Mathematics* **14** AMS, Providence, RI, second edition (2001).

[LSST] E. H. Lieb, I. M. Sigal, B. Simon, and W. Thirring: Asymptotic neutrality of large-Z ions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **116**, 635-644 (1988).

[LT] E.H. Lieb and W. Thirring : Universal nature of van der Waals forces for Coulomb systems. *Phys. Rev. A* **34** No.1, 40-46 (1986).

[MA] B. H. Mahan and R.J. Myers: University Chemistry. *Addiso-Wesley Publishing company, inc* (1987).

[PST] G. Panati, H. Spohn and S. Teufel: The time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer Approximation. *ESIAM: Math. Model. and Num. Anal.* **41**, 297-314 (2007).

[Phan] Phan Thành Nam. New bounds on the maximum ionization of atoms. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 2012 (to appear).

[RSIV] M. Reed and B. Simon: Methods of modern Mathematical Physics IV: Analysis of Operators. *Academic Press Inc.* (1980).

[Rus] M.B. Ruskai: Absence of discrete spectrum in highly negative ions, II. Extension to Fermions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **82** No.2, 325-327 (1982).

[SSS] L. A. Seco, I. M. Sigal, and J. P. Solovej: Bound on the ionization energy of large atoms. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **131** No.2, 307-315 (1990).

[Sen] F. Senese: General Chemistry Online! http://antoine.frostburg.edu/chem/senese/101/index.shtml Revised 2010.

[Sig] I.M. Sigal: Geometric methods in the quantum many-body problem. Non-existence of very negative ions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **85**, 309-324 (1982).

[Sig2] I.M. Sigal: How many electrons can a nucleus bind? *Ann. Phys.* **157** No.2, 307-320 (1984).

[Sol1] J.P. Solovej: Proof of the ionization conjecture in a reduced Hartree-Fock model. *Invent. Math.* **104** No.1, 291-311 (1991).

[Sol2] J.P. Solovej: The ionization conjecture in Hartree-Fock theory. *Ann. of Math.* **158**, 509-576 (2003).

[Wiki] Wikipedia, Van der Waals force.